270
M866h
V. 7

BX945 .M6813 1930
v.7
Mourret, Fernand, 1854-1938.
A history of the Catholic
church

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/historyofcatholi0007mour

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME SEVEN

Period of the French Revolution

(1775-1823)

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS 2, MO.
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.

270
M866h
V.7

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-507

IMPRIMATUR

✠ Joseph E. Ritter, S.T.D.
Archbishop of St. Louis

August 27, 1954

45927

COPYRIGHT 1955 BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Printed in the United States of America
by Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton, New York

CONTENTS

PAGE
INTRODUCTION 3

PART I

DECLINE OF THE ANCIENT REGIME

CHAPTER
I. THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CRISIS 9
Abuse of Royal Absolutism 12
The Clergy 14
Josephism and Febronianism 16
The Punctuation of Ems 16
Synod of Pistoia 18
Church and State in France 20

II. THE INTELLECTUAL CRISIS 23
The Philosophical Movement in England 24
The Philosophical Movement in Germany 25
The Philosophical Movement in Italy 27
The Philosophical Movement in Holland 29
French Philosophers 32
Voltaire 33
Rousseau 35
Influence of the New Theories 38
The Clergy 43

III. THE FIRST YEARS OF THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS VI . . 46
Pius VI 46
The Pope's Popularity 48
The Danger of Philosophism 50
Pius VI's Visit to Vienna 52
Difficulties with Russia 55
Grand Duke of Tuscany 57

PART II

THE REVOLUTION

CHAPTER PAGE
IV. THE CHURCH DESPOILED 63
The Conditions in France in 1789 64
The Assembly 65
The Upper Clergy 67
The Lawyers 69
The Lower Clergy 69
Abbé Sieyès 70
Mirabeau 72
Beginning of the Anarchy 74
The Pillage of St. Lazare 74
The Taking of the Bastille 76
The Provinces 78
The Night of August 4 79
The Tithes 81
Hostility toward the Holy See 82
The Cahiers of the Three Orders 84
The Clergy 84
The Three Principles of the Declaration 88
Development of Anarchy 90
Four Destructions 92
Church Property 95
Talleyrand 97
Abbé Maury 100
The Religious Orders 106
Church and State 112
The Civil Constitution of the Clergy 116
Final Appeal 119
The Civil Constitution of the Clergy 121
Foreign Views of the Revolution 125
Pius VI's Inaction 127
The Pope and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy . . 132

V. THE PERSECUTION 137
The Taking of the Oath by the Clergy 138
Aim of the Assembly 140

CHAPTER PAGE
Louis XVI and Pius VI 144
The Avignon Affair 147
Abbé Grégoire 152
Bishops Boisgelin and Bonal 154
The Papal Condemnation 156
The Constitutional Clergy 158
Archbishop Gobel 159
Bishop Grégoire 161
The Legislative Assembly 167
Cardinal Bernis 171
The Provinces 172
New Laws of Persecution 174
Execution of Priests 176
Danton 179
Imprisonments 180
The Taking of Verdun 182
The September Massacres 184
Massacres at the Abbaye 185
Massacres at the Carmelite Monastery 187
Further Massacres 189
The Oath of Liberty and Equality 192
The Convention (1792–95) 196
The *Emigré* Priests 199
The *Emigrés* in Germany 205
The *Emigré* Priests in Italy 209
The *Emigré* Priests in America 212
Fresh Outbreak of Revolutionary Persecution 215
Execution of Louis XVI 219
Consequences of the King's Execution 221
The Liturgy 226
The Constitutional Clergy 228
Despotism of the Convention 231
Brittany and the Vendée 236
The First Vendean Insurgents 241
Cathelineau 243
The Second Period 246
The Other Provinces 250
The Vendée and Brittany 257
The Constitutional Church (1795) 265

CHAPTER PAGE
VI. THE CHURCH SUPPLANTED BY CIVIL RELIGION 271
Second Encyclical of the Constitutionals 275
Decrees of the Pseudo-Council 278
Failure of the Council 279
A National Religion 280
The Weekly Holyday 284
Irreligion (1789–99) 287
The Terror under the Directory 289
The Armistice of Bologna 293
Recoil of the Directory 295
The Taking of Rome 298
The Persecution in France 300
Exiles in Guiana 302
The Interned Priests 305
Deeds of the Directory 310
The Persecution in Belgium 312
Motive of the Persecution 314
Sacking of Rome 317
Pius VI in France 321

PART III

TOWARD A RELIGIOUS RESTORATION

VII. THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN 1799 327
The Protestants 328
The Jews 329
The Freemasons 331
Vitality of Catholicism 332
Popular Feelings 334
Switzerland 337
The Catholic Cantons 338
Ireland 340
Napoleon 342
The Conclave 344
Election of Pius VII 346
Life of Pius VII 347
Pius VII and Bonaparte 349

CHAPTER PAGE
VIII. THE FRENCH CONCORDAT OF 1801 350
First Acts of Pius VII 350
Roman Distrust 355
Louis XVIII 359
Papal Envoys to Paris 363
Spina and Bernier 366
First Proposals 368
Diplomatic Activities 370
Consalvi and Bonaparte 374
The New Concordat 378
Ratification of the Concordat 380
The Organic Articles 383
Religious Situation 385
Resistance of *Emigré* Bishops 389
The Significance of the Concordat 392
Protestantism in France 398
Napoleon Proclaimed Emperor 402
The Coronation 406
Humiliations of the Pope 408

IX. THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRE (1804–14) 410
Napoleon's Project 410
The Marriage of Jerome Bonaparte 412
Conflict between Napoleon and the Pope 415
The Holy Roman Empire 417
New Threats 420
Sentence of Excommunication 424
Arrest of Pius VII 426
Imprisonment of the Pope 428
Napoleon's Divorce 430
The French Church 435
French National Council of 1811 442
Pius VII at Fontainebleau 445
The Concordat 447
Napoleon and the Protestants 450
Napoleon and the Jews 452
Napoleon and the Freemasons 454

X. LAST YEARS OF PIUS VII 457
European Situation 458

CHAPTER PAGE
The Holy Alliance 462
The Church in France 468
Concordats 472
The Papal States 478

XI. THE RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT 481
Chateaubriand 482
Joseph de Maistre 486
Louis de Bonald 488
The Clergy 490
La Mennais 493
Germany 497
England 505

XII. THE FOREIGN MISSIONS 508
Interest in the Foreign Missions 509
New Apostolic Workers 511
Korea 514
India 516
China 518

XIII. THE EASTERN CHURCH 523
Non-Catholic Greek Church of Constantinople . . . 523
Melchite Catholic Church of Antioch 530
The Churches of Eastern Europe 533
The Ruthenian Catholic Church 541
The Catholic Church in Russia 547
Alexander I 552

APPENDIX I. DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN 559

APPENDIX II. FRENCH CONCORDAT OF 1801 562

BIBLIOGRAPHY 575

INDEX 587

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume VII

I. Decline of the Ancient Regime
II. The Revolution
III. The Religious Restoration

Introduction

VOLUME VI of this history of the Church described the elements of religious revival and social preservation that made the "great century." It also discussed the various heretical, irreligious, and antisocial currents that prepared for the French Revolution. The present volume has the following aims: 1. an account of the various efforts of the papacy, from 1775 to 1789, to preserve from religious and social decadence the Christian nations, which had been undermined by a spirit of revolt and impiety; 2. a description of the persecutions undergone by the Church in its possessions, in the person of its faithful, and in its worship, from 1789 to 1799, under the regime of the unrestrained Revolution; 3. a picture of the religious revival that took place following the storm, from 1800 to 1823, not merely among Catholic peoples but also in the countries where heresy prevailed, and consequently even in the infidel regions most remote from the center of Christianity.

Two long pontificates filled this period. From 1775 to 1799, Pius VI attempted at first to restrain the revolutionary movement; then he resisted it courageously. From 1800 to 1823, Pius VII, amid countless difficulties, directed the work of the Catholic restoration.

Sincere and competent persons, viewing the events from opposite points of view, have expressed divergent appreciations of the Revolution. According to Ballanche and Buchez, the Revolution was a reflection, even a social realization, of Christianity.[1] Joseph de Maistre regarded it as satanic in its very essence.[2]

Indeed certain declarations of the first leaders of the Revolution—about individual liberty, equality before the law, the brotherhood of man, justice in the application of punishments —are nothing more than an echo of the truths promulgated by the gospel. They are the reverse of the morality prevailing in the days of the pagan world. But if, in the work of the Revolution, we consider the war upon the Church and the application of the theories of the social contract, we can to some extent agree with De Maistre's severe judgment.

The French Revolution was indeed a most complex affair. To appraise it fairly, we should distinguish its three movements from one another: the political reform, the social renovation, and the anti-Catholic persecution.

The movement of political reform, if considered within the limits of the desires expressed by the cahiers of the States General, can be approved in its main lines. The clergy of the two orders defended it earnestly, King Louis XVI favored it without ulterior considerations.[3]

The movement of social renovation was unfortunately inspired by the false principles of Rousseau. Today we no longer have any need of showing their falsity. Experience has manifested the emptiness of those utopias. The ideas of original perfection, of absolute equality, and of the social contract have to give way before the sounder ideas of original corruption, of a necessary hierarchy, and of tradition.

As for the movement of anti-Catholic persecution, from 1789 to 1799, from Mirabeau to Robespierre and from Robespierre to Barras, it simply advanced toward a more radical and more sectarian impiety. We may well condemn this aspect of the Revolution with utmost severity. The present volume will be devoted mostly to an account of this third movement.

---

[1] Buchez, *Traité de philosophie,* III, 571–73; Ballanche, *Œuvres,* VI, 268.

[2] De Maistre, *Considérations sur la France,* chap. 5.

[3] Cf. Godefroid Kurth, *The Church at the Turning Points of History,* 1929, pp. 159 ff.

What aggravated the character of this movement is that it not only developed parallel to the other two movements, but progressively invaded them and penetrated them with its spirit. Gradually it became their heart and soul. The formulas of the Declaration of the Rights of Man are susceptible of being understood and accepted in a Christian sense. But they were interpreted and applied in the sense of the unbelieving philosophers of the eighteenth century. Thereupon the political reforms themselves collapsed lamentably: the reaction against the royal absolutism of the old regime led merely to the despotism of the Convention and the corruption of the Directory; the aristocracy of the old nobility merely gave place to the oligarchy of the ideologists; the court clergy, formerly too dependent on the king, disappeared only to give free play to a constitutional clergy, servilely submissive to the new government. The old state religion survived in a way under the form of an official worship, rigidly imposed on all. This new religion was the worship of the Revolution, whose "immortal principles" were regarded as sacred, whose laws were untouchable, whose heroes were thought worthy of apotheosis, and whose violators were considered guilty of treason and of betrayal of justice. We may perhaps see in this attitude the basic error of the Revolution. The Revolution did more than create a new state religion; it became itself the object of a new religion, destined to supplant the old one. The state was conceived as a sort of Church against the Church.

Humanly speaking, we may say that in those conditions Christianity appeared to succumb, and the triumph of the Revolution seemed to be final. However, the contrary happened. A certain writer, who often has the appearance of a prophet and sometimes the intuitions of one, wrote in 1796 as follows:

> Attend to my words, all of you who have not been well instructed by history. You said that the scepter sustained the tiara. Well, now the scepter has been crushed. You did not know how far the influence of a rich and powerful priesthood could sustain the dogmas it preached. Now the priests are no more; or at least those who escaped the guillotine and deportation now receive the alms which formerly they bestowed. You feared the force of custom, the dominance of authority. Now we no longer have customs, no longer any masters; each man's spirit is his own. You no longer need fear the enchantment of the eyes; men no longer behold the magnificence of ceremonial pomp; the temples are closed. . . . Philosophism has nothing to complain of; all the chances are in its favor. . . . But if Christianity comes through this terrible trial purer and more vigorous, if a Christian Hercules by his own strength raises up the son of the earth and stifles him in his arms, *patuit Deus,* God is there. . . .[4]
>
> The clergy of France should not sleep; they have numerous reasons for thinking they are summoned to a great mission. The same conjectures that enabled them to perceive for what they suffered, also permit them to believe themselves destined to an essential undertaking.[5]

Fifteen years later the prediction was fully realized. At the dawn of the new century the clergy of France, chastened by poverty and matured by persecution, filled their temples with the joyous Easter alleluias. The French concordat became the model after which the principal nations regulated the conditions of their religious life. *The Genius of Christianity,* translated into all languages, carried the echo of a Catholic rebirth everywhere. And again France gave to the distant apostolate the most intrepid of its laborers and the most abundant of its resources, by the restoration of the foreign missions and the formation of the work of the Propagation of the Faith.

---

[4] De Maistre, *ibid.,* chap. 5.

[5] *Ibid.,* chap. 2.

PART I

DECLINE OF THE ANCIENT REGIME

THE Protestant Revolt was furthered by the misunderstandings arising from the need of a religious reform; the French Revolution took place in consequence of the attitude produced by the need of a political and social reform. But neither the statesmen, who were won over to the new ideas or were blind to the dangers of those ideas, nor the churchmen, too long absorbed in matters of internal conflicts and too often influenced by the doctrines they had to combat, were able to assume in time the leadership of the reform movement. This movement was marked by an anti-Christian and revolutionary spirit, under the direction of a rationalist philosophy. A history of the Revolution, therefore, will not be adequate unless we first study the political and intellectual crises that prepared the way for it.

CHAPTER I

The Political and Social Crisis

THIS crisis is marked by three European political facts: a great event of world-wide political significance, and two profound modifications in the internal organization of human society, particularly of French society.

The War of the Austrian Succession, the partition of Poland, and the expulsion of the Jesuits are events for which the great courts of Europe were responsible. But these three events showed an abdication of the old traditional public law, the lack of respect that was accorded to solemn agreements, and the ignoring of the established sovereignties, particularly the spiritual sovereignty of the pope. The War of the Austrian Succession showed that the might of states could take precedence over the rights of sovereigns; and the partition of Poland showed that the might of sovereigns could take precedence over the rights of states.[1] By the expulsion of the Jesuits, a deed concerted and matured in the Bourbon courts, civil society showed its determination to interfere in the organization of the Church and to regulate the activity of the Church by its own initiative.

On the other hand, men were stirred by the enthusiasm which the American War of Independence evoked. The Declaration of Independence (1776) was based on the civil and political equality of the citizens. In the preamble of the Declaration we read: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, . . . that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it." In France on June 11, 1780, the Assembly of the Clergy, when asked to grant a subsidy to the government on the occasion of the American war, generously voted a gift of 30,000,000 francs without any discussion about the particular character of the war.[2]

---

[1] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* I, 89. Voltaire wrote to Frederick II: "Sire, you are said to be the one who imagined the partition of Poland. I believe it is so, because it has the mark of genius." Letter of November 19, 1772.

The events of foreign policy coincided with a crisis of the internal institutions in the European nations, particularly in France. A spirit of impatience over feudal rights and an undercurrent of revolt against royal absolutism were the chief signs of this crisis.

At the close of the eighteenth century serfdom was completely abolished in almost no part of Germany. Generally the people remained attached to the soil, as in the Middle Ages. Nearly all the soldiers making up the armies of Frederick II and Maria Theresa had been serfs.[3] England was also administered as well as governed by the wealthy landowners.

But while the people saw the nobility assure public order, render justice, execute the laws, and come to the aid of the weak, they had endured without much impatience, almost as the public of today supports its government, the burdensome rights and the sometimes irksome privileges of the landed aristocracy. But according as the latter ceased to render the services corresponding to its rights, its authority became more onerous.

The weight of this authority was felt particularly in France. Serfdom, which had almost completely disappeared, continued only in one or two provinces. Almost everywhere the peasant ceased to be a serf. He even became a landowner. But this very situation made more unbearable for him the permanence of the feudal taxes that weighed so heavily on him and that were pitilessly collected by intendants for the profit of a nobility living in affluent ease at the court. In a celebrated chapter of the *Origines de la France contemporaine,* Taine speaks of those "thoroughbreds that had double or triple rations that they might be idle and might do nothing after all, while the draft horses rendered full service on a half-ration which often they did not receive." [4] In a less figurative language, Alexis de Tocqueville depicts the French peasant at the close of the eighteenth century, as a small landowner, passionately fond of that piece of land which he has bought out of his savings, everywhere confronted with the privilege of his powerful neighbor who annoys and hinders him. To acquire his property he had to pay a tax, not to the government, but to a big near-by landowner, a man as unconnected with the government as the peasant himself. This same neighbor obliges him to abandon the cultivation of his fields in order to render some service without pay; or he waits for him at the crossing of some stream to require a toll tax from him. Or the peasant goes to market, where the powerful neighbor sells to him the right to sell his own produce; and when, upon returning home, he wishes to use for himself what is left of his grain, he can do so only after sending it to be ground in the mill and baked in the oven of that same man.[5] Feudalism had been one of our greatest and most beneficent national institutions. Upon ceasing to fulfill the social function for which it had been established, feudalism became a most serious danger.

---

[2] Picot, *Mémoires* (3rd ed., 1855), V, 131–34.

[3] A. de Tocqueville, *L'ancien régime et la Révolution,* pp. 53 f.

---

[4] Taine, *L'ancien régime,* Vol. I, Bk. I, chap. 4. "About the middle of the eighteenth century, if, in the material and moral budget, you were to make two totals, one for the debts, the other for the credits, you could have calculated that the more capital a man contributed the less dividend he received. The privations of the large number supplied the superabundance of the small number. This fact applied to all the categories, thanks to the effective preferences favoring the court nobles at the expense of the provincial nobles, the nobility at the expense of the commoners, the cities at the expense of the country districts, and in general the strong at the expense of the weak. This scandalous disproportion finally shocked everyone, because almost everyone suffered from it." Taine, *Le régime moderne,* II, 80.

[5] Tocqueville, *op. cit.,* p. 86.

Abuse of Royal Absolutism

The same may be said of royal absolutism, which had been rendered inevitable by the need of restraining the factions of the great nobles and of guaranteeing national unity. This absolutism at its origin was as popular as the feudal institutions had been. But this absolute power of the kings now became a cause of political and social unrest. Only the appearance remained of those municipal institutions which, from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth, had turned many cities of Germany, Italy, and England into little, wealthy, and enlightened republics, powerful and free cities. The communal activity, energy, and patriotism, together with the virile and fruitful virtues which they had inspired, gradually disappeared. Those provincial assemblies and those states general, where unhampered initiative and the free speech of the people of France used to be openly displayed, were abolished or survived merely in name.

We should, of course, avoid confusing the absolutism of Philip V of Spain, of Maria Theresa of Austria, or even of Louis XIV and Louis XV with that of an Oriental potentate or with that of an emperor of the Roman decadence. The great jurist Loyseau said that three kinds of law limit the power of the sovereign: the laws of God, the rules of natural justice, and the fundamental laws of the state. The basis of this limitation is that the prince is bound to make use of his sovereignty according to its proper nature and the conditions thus established. Bossuet observes: "To say that government should be absolute, is one thing; to say that it should be arbitrary, is something else. Even in empires certain laws exist, against which any enactment or deed is null." [6]

In a certain sense, the royal power of Louis XIV, by its undeniable glories, shows the most perfect accord of the people in one man that history has ever seen. But the very prestige of those glories created a danger. Says La Bruyère: "Whoever considers that the countenance of the prince makes a courtier's whole joy, will understand a little how seeing God can make the whole happiness of the saints." In reality, however, these earthly gods were merely gods of flesh and blood, or clay and dust. Too often, instead of governing solely for the nation, they governed for themselves.

---

[6] Bossuet, *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte,* Bk. VIII, art. 1, prop. 1.

After overthrowing all the ancient political pillars of the state to assure for themselves alone the whole power of government, they make the royal power like a Gothic cathedral where the height of the structure and the pointed arches have been pushed to the point of paradox. They must govern with the maximum of foresight, order, and moderation if they are to avoid seeing the edifice totter on its foundation. . . . Were the successors of Louis XIV at the height of their duties? We believe that the historian cannot truthfully say that they were. The central power too often became the prey of intrigues by courtiers and favorites. It lost something of its stability and prestige. The government remained absolute, but its action fell into incoherence. France no longer had at its head a monarch who guided it confidently along the glorious path of its destinies. Soon at the very heart of the overcentralized nation a sort of corruption appeared as in a fruit that is overripe. As the common soul grew weak in the person of the king, each one regretted the earlier sacrifice of independence, the people became accustomed to despise its leaders, and anarchy tended to break out in the centralization.[7]

From all these disproportions, all these faulty adaptations, and all these dangers, the whole nation suffered, not merely the peasant and the artisan, but also the nobleman, the great lord, the prelate, and the king himself.[8] We shall see in the sequel what the grievances of the cahiers of 1789 were. But already in 1775, in a remonstrance dated May 6, the court of aids said:

---

[7] G. A. Gautheror, *Conférences sur les origines de la Révolution,* conference 2, p. 12.

[8] Taine, *Le régime moderne,* II, 80.

"They have labored to stifle in France the entire municipal spirit, to extinguish it, if they could, even to the feelings of the citizens. They have, as it were, interdicted the whole nation." [9] In a speech (February 23, 1787), delivered by order of the King and in his presence, M. de Calonne declared: "The abuses that men talk of abolishing are of serious importance and are the ones most protected." [10]

The Clergy

This political and social crisis brought so much suffering to the Church because, in consequence of her close union with the state, she found herself intricately involved in it. By her upper clergy she was involved in those privileges with rights that became daily more hated. She had the entree in those courts where the affairs of the country were centralized. Moreover, in the person of the humblest of her priests, the little country curé *à portion congrue,* she heard the griefs of the people, whose burdens and miseries the pastors shared.[11] Berulle, Vincent de Paul, Olier, Hofbauer, and Alphonsus Liguori had strongly imprinted a virile faith and a firm discipline on the clergy of the ancient regime. These qualities had enabled this great body of the state to escape, in large part, that corruption of the people of the world, those utopias of the literary class, and that irritation of the common people, which constituted the essential ills of the closing years of that century. Two favorable traits showed this fact morally and socially: a spirit of charity, manifesting itself on every occasion with chivalrous generosity,[12] and a spirit of fervor that remained alive in chosen souls, which the scandals of the time did but stimulate. Yet the clergy of the eighteenth century did not succeed in avoiding a threefold danger.

---

[9] Gustave Gautherot, *op. cit.,* p. 17.

[10] Quoted by Taine, *op. cit.,* II, 81.

[11] On the wretched situation of the curés *à portion congrue,* see Taine, *L'ancien régime,* I, 114–20.

[12] Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 109.

In the practice of charity they were too inclined to follow in the wake of the philosophers of the age; they too often used the language and the so-called principles of those philosophers. They did not appeal earnestly enough to the strong theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, where they would have found many fruitful maxims and many safe rules. Nor did they appeal loudly enough to the traditions of the Church, where they would have met many fine models; and thus they allowed the sentimental philosophy of the eighteenth century to profit by the prestige of their devotedness.[13]

Between the two orders of the clergy a chasm had been opened by the social and political conditions. The clergy themselves made this gulf the more evident. The upper clergy, drawn from the ranks of the nobility and the higher bourgeoisie, sometimes laid claim to honors instead of devoting themselves to the ministry of souls. The lower clergy, recruited from the humblest ranks of society, often had nothing but duties to perform without profit or honor to encourage them. More than one poor priest, upon returning from the bishop's residence where he had beheld the splendors of a princely installation, kept a bitter remembrance of the riches he had seen. Perhaps, in his lowly presbytery, he cast his eyes on some issue of the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques,* in which the Jansenist party railed at the luxury and the attitudes that were traits of the nobility and that had been introduced into the Church. Or his eyes might fall upon one of those revolutionary pamphlets which the Encyclopedists were circulating in the most remote provinces.[14] Then the poor plebeian curé felt arising in his soul a vague feeling of unrest and hatred, no less threatening to the social order and the peace of the Church than was the blind tranquillity of the great Church dignitary taking his repose in the luxury of his sumptuous palace.[15]

---

[13] Cf. *ibid.,* II, 43, 101; Kurth, *op. cit.,* pp. 182 ff.

[14] In 1782 Archibishop du Lau of Arles noted the scandalous spread of the works of Voltaire and Rousseau. He complained that licentious writings were thrown at night even into the enclosures of monasteries. See De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* I, 67.

In fine, part of the upper clergy let themselves be drawn into too close alliances with the state. The three chief centers of these alliances were Vienna, Florence, and Paris.

Josephism and Febronianism

Toward the end of the eighteenth century two theories, often confused by historians because they were themselves merged in a common action, obtained a great credit with the king and the upper clergy. These were Josephism and Febronianism.

The Josephist theory, much earlier constructed by the jurists and confused with texts of the Roman law, maintained that the religious establishment was a matter of the civil government. Maria Theresa, and especially Joseph II, had injected this system into the laws. It renewed, in aggravated form, the errors of the Caesarean Gallicanism of the kings of France.

The Febronian theory, based on arguments of a canonical order and on conciliar texts of the fifteenth century, particularly on the rights of the sovereign, revived and exaggerated the claims of the episcopal Gallicanism of the French bishops. The leading bishops of Germany, chosen from the most devoted partisans of the emperor, spread the spirit of this view.

The Punctuation of Ems

But the exigencies of the strife soon practically united the adherents of the two theories. In 1781 Febronianism, in the person of its chief, Nikolaus von Hontheim, placed itself at the service of Josephism. Five years later the three ecclesiastical electors of the Empire—Baron Charles Joseph von Herthal (archbishop of Mainz), Clement Wenceslaus of Trier, and Archduke Maximilian Franz of Cologne—together with the Archbishop of Salzburg, sealed the alliance in the famous twenty-three declarations, known in history under the name of the Punctuation of Ems.

---

[15] Many priests even went so far as to join Masonic lodges. See De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

As Cardinal Pacca wrote in his *Mémoires,* the Churches and the clergy of Germany, at the close of the eighteenth century, were at the height of human greatness. The most beautiful and most fertile regions of Germany belonged to the clergy, who there possessed the right of temporal sovereignty. In the electoral college, out of eight electors three were ecclesiastics: these were the archbishops of Mainz, of Trier, and of Cologne. When we reflect that these prelates in their opulence were not greatly satisfied to pay the levy imposed on them by the Holy See,[16] that they were easily faultfinding with regard to that Roman power, and that their spirit of absolutism took proud pleasure in holding up their crosiers in the presence of the tiara, we are not surprised at their complacency toward the new movement. Pecuniary interest, the desire to flatter public opinion, and their hierarchical sensibilities, all conspired to stiffen them against Rome. Says Hergenröther: "A large number of bishops dreamed of establishing a national German Church." [17]

The Congress of Ems, held in the month of August, 1786, declared that the pope had no right to send nuncios invested with any jurisdiction. Its members acknowledged in the Sovereign Pontiff merely a right of primacy and of general inspection; but, on the other hand, they granted to all the bishops the most absolute right of binding and loosing, without any recourse from the episcopal jurisdiction to the jurisdiction of the Holy See. Every bull, every papal brief, was to be regarded as null unless received and accepted by the bishops. The declarations of Ems mark the last insurrection of ecclesiastical nationalism against the Roman Catholicism. They were eagerly backed and encouraged by Emperor Joseph II. But many members of the episcopate, notably the bishops of Freising and Spires, taking umbrage at the slight account which at Ems was taken of the right of simple bishops, voiced energetic protests. The nuncio at Munich, Zoglio, and the nuncio at Cologne, Pacca, sustained them in the name of Rome. The people joined their voices to them in the name of its traditions. Josephist statesmen and Febronian prelates thus had against them the ancestors of that Catholic people which more than once in the course of the nineteenth century would constrain the upper clergy of Germany to take account of the directions of Rome. By a letter dated November 14, 1789, a masterpiece of calm and moderate firmness, Pope Pius VI condemned the doctrine of the four bishops. The controversy died out in the uproar of the French Revolution.

---

[16] The Roman monetary demands on the prince electors appear excessive if we simply look at the figures. But the amount that had to be paid once and for all by the archbishop of Mainz was no more than a twenty-eighth of his annual revenue. G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse,* I, 39–42.

[17] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. VII, Bk. II, Part II, chap. 4.

Synod of Pistoia

But another center of revolt against Rome was lighted up in Italy, where the brother of Emperor Joseph II, Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, was maintaining similar principles. Joseph II found his inspiration in the philosophers; Leopold I welcomed the teaching of the Jansenists. However, on the question of the relations between Church and state, the two doctrines easily came into accord. The man whom Leopold used to consult for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs was Scipio Ricci. This man was an ambitious and intriguing bishop whom the Emperor put in the see of Pistoia in 1780. He was related to the general of the Society of Jesus, the celebrated Lorenzo Ricci, who had died five months before as a prisoner in the Castle Sant' Angelo following the events related in the preceding volume. Bishop Ricci, a daring and meddlesome man, had early embraced the principles of Jansenism. A faithful imitator of the "appelants" of France, he took for himself and proposed to others as a model the following four men: Soanen, whom he called "the great bishop," Quesnel "the martyr for truth," and Mésenguy and Gourlin "the lights of the Church." He said that his aim was to combat the "spiritual Babylon," for the communion of saints and the independence of the princes. He gathered about him a few priests already known for their liberal opinions: Tamburini, Zola, Natali, Bottieri, and Palmieri. Then, in agreement with Grand Duke Leopold, he convoked at Pistoia a synod intended to provide a remedy for the abuses in the Church.

The Synod of Pistoia, which opened on September 18, 1786, was attended by 234 priests. They began by proclaiming the principles of the most radical Jansenism on faith, grace, and predestination. They forbade the worship of the Sacred Heart. Ricci had a special antipathy for this devotion. Then the question of the authority of the Church was taken up. They proclaimed the pope the ministerial head of the Church. This view, taken in the sense that the pope received his powers from the Church itself, was heretical. They adopted the four articles of 1682. Further, they declared that, in the doctrine of salvation, nothing is true except what goes back to antiquity, and that what has been produced in the course of time is necessarily false. Consequently they maintained that all the doctrinal decisions reached in the Church during recent centuries are without any authority. Lastly, they invited Leopold to reform the Church by virtue of his own authority, to abolish certain feast days, to regulate the parishes; and they expressed the wish that all the religious orders should be reduced to a single one, in accordance with the constitutions of Port Royal.

Ricci's project was to have the Pistoia decrees confirmed by a national council. With a view to preparing for such a council, Leopold summoned the seventeen bishops of Tuscany to meet at Florence in April, 1787. Only three answered the summons. The meeting could not be held. The clergy became divided. The popular opinion turned against Ricci, and his palace was sacked. When, upon the death of Joseph II in 1790, Leopold left Tuscany and ascended the imperial throne, the Bishop of Pistoia was obliged to abandon his see and flee to Florence. Four years later Pope Pius VI, after mature examination, issued his bull *Auctorem fidei* (August 28, 1794), condemning eighty-five propositions taken from the Synod of Pistoia.[18] The papal bull was generally received respectfully. Bishop Benedict Solari of Noli was the only prelate who publicly refused to publish it.

Church and State in France

France did not witness manifestations of this sort until after the fall of the monarchy, when it was evidenced by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. But, ever since the beginning of the eighteenth century, the spirit that dominated the relations of the state with the upper clergy was very much like that which animated the courts of Vienna and Florence.

As Pierre de La Gorce says, close to every cathedral stood an edifice having the appearance of a palace. This mansion was the bishop's residence. No presentation, whether of the bishops of the province or of the local authorities, guided or hindered the decision of the prince. Under the title of *ministre de feuille*, the monarch had a sort of minister of worship who proposed to him the candidates to be nominated. This high office was held, until 1777, by Bishop Jarente of Orléans, an unworthy prelate. The Holy See refused to grant institution to the person thus designated. At the end of Louis XIV's reign, Massilon wrote: "The Church has no need of great names, but of great virtues." In the eighteenth century the practice had become established of nominating to prelacies only men of the nobility. In the list of bishops given in the royal almanac of 1788, we find all the great houses of the kingdom represented. At Metz was a Montmorency; at Strasbourg, a Rohan; at La Rochelle, a Crussol; at Besançon, a Durfort; at Laon, a Sabran; at Auch, a La Tour du Pin. In 1789 we find two Talleyrands, "as though one would not have been enough." [19] The 1,500 church benefices subject to royal nomination "became a sort of mint for the benefit of the great. In accordance with the custom of giving more to those who have the most, the wealthiest prelates had, over and above their episcopal revenue, the richest abbeys. According to the Almanac, Bishop Rohan of Strasbourg thus had an additional income of 60,000 livres; Archbishop La Rochefoucault of Rouen, 130,000." [20]

---

[18] Denz., nos. 1501–99.

These immense incomes were used by some to maintain "the dignity of their rank," as they said; by others, to reward the assiduous attentions of their close friends. Still others, more scandalously, spent these incomes at the court.[21] A type of these court prelates was that Duke de Rohan, bishop of Strasbourg, whose culpable and heedless conduct in the "affair of the necklace" stirred popular indignation against the Queen. Another was La Font de Savine. His family's influence with Louis XVI obtained for him in 1778 the bishopric of Viviers. By the rashness of his doctrines and also by the oddities of his life he was deservedly called by his followers the Rousseau of the clergy.[22]

---

[19] De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* I, 41.

[20] Taine, *L'ancien régime,* I, 101.

[21] D'Argenson, with some exaggeration, exclaims: "The court! In this word is the whole evil. The court has become the Senate of the realm; the lowest Versailles valet is a senator; the chambermaids are part of the government. . . . The court is the death of the nation." Quoted by Taine, *op. cit.,* I, 113.

We do not see the authoritative representatives of the French clergy opposed to a reform of the ecclesiastical organization. None dared to demand the maintenance of the *status quo*. On May 29, 1790, Archbishop Boisgelin of Aix, speaking in the name of the clergy of the Assembly, declared: "Undoubtedly, abuses must be reformed, and a new order of things must be introduced." [23]

In what spirit would this needed reform take place? The Archbishop of Aix asked that the reform be undertaken by the Church, or at least with the consent of the Church. But the Gallicans and the Jansenists wished to have it accomplished by the state alone; and the so-called philosophers thought of having it carried out in the spirit of their doctrines. These last tendencies would prevail. The political crisis, which was threatening the ruin of the ancient regime, would be complicated by a no less formidable intellectual crisis, which tended to nothing less than the overthrow of the very foundations of the social order.

---

[22] Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 51.

[23] *Moniteur* of May 30, 1790, p. 610.

CHAPTER II

The Intellectual Crisis

Joseph de Maistre says that the French Revolution was prepared by its victims. But this statement, if taken without qualification, is an exaggeration. The Revolution, that is, the revolutionary and antireligious character given to the legitimate movement of reform which took place at the close of the eighteenth century, was owing to unchristian philosophy. Robespierre's triumph was prepared by Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

We cannot say that the revolutionary spirit originated in France alone. If the French Revolution so promptly won practically all Europe to its cause, that success and consequence is to be traced to the fact that everywhere the soil was well prepared for it. England, Germany, Italy, and Holland were ready to receive the revolutionary poison. We know how much in the way of ideas Voltaire took from the English philosophers. Rousseau's chief principle, that the moral question merges into the social question, that is, the origin of our evils does not come to us from our nature but from the organization of the society in which we live, is a principle taken over from English philosophy. In Germany the advisers of Joseph II got their inspiration from the Lutheran Reformers as much as from the French philosophers. In Italy the utopias of Campanella and the fiery verses of Alfieri in behalf of abstract and almost deified liberty had almost the same tone as the enthusiastic pages of the French visionaries. In Protestant Holland the disciples of Grotius and Spinoza did not wait for the publication of the *Encyclopedia* and of the *Social Contract* before they fancied a complete restoration of the law of nations and of the political organization. The revolutionary spirit was everywhere. And everywhere, in the elation of minds and the eagerness of efforts, the same two traits stood out: the utopia in the ideal aimed at and the violence in the proposed means. These will be the two elements of the Revolution, which will be the work of the ideologist and of the Jacobin.

The Philosophical Movement in England

In England, from More to Hobbes and Locke, social philosophy developed with theories that possessed an unheard-of daring.

In Thomas More's *Utopia,* which appeared at the beginning of the sixteenth century, how much was purely chimerical and how much was serious? [1] The fantastic paradox, which aroused the attention and tempered astonishment with a smile, was often the form chosen by the innovators to insinuate more surely the truths they considered useful. More's *Utopia* was clearly inspired by Plato's *Republic.* The Greek philosopher had said: "So long as the wise will not be kings and so long as the kings will not be philosophers, no remedy will be found for the evils that desolate the states." Like Plato, More made his whole social conception rest on the criticism of ownership. His ideal was a society where all goods would be in common. He was. however, far removed from Plato by a broad feeling of humaneness and by a deep sympathy for the classes that suffered. His republic had no castes: each citizen was called on to engage in material labors, ennobled by intellectual recreations. The principle of power was placed in the consent of the people, and the regime of the state was that of an industrious and democratic republic.

What More had conceived with his Catholic spirit, sincerely submissive to the Church, Hobbes and Locke took up from an entirely different point of view. Imbued with Bacon's utilitarian ideas,[2] which were far from being lofty or philosophical, they set forth the plan of their society, based on the ideas of conservation and interest. Hobbes established the theory of absolutism, but based it on such arguments that he stirred discussion of it and opposition to it. For him morality is not an end; it is a means, the means for having order and peace.[3]

---

[1] *De optimo reipublicae statu, deque nova insula Utopia,* first published in 1516.

Hobbes had written against the English Revolution; Locke took up his pen in its defense. Hobbes was the first to imagine that the origin of civil society might be found in a certain state preceding society. Locke set out from the same hypothesis. But there, where Hobbes thought he could establish the basis of despotism, Locke claimed to find the justification for a permanent right of rebellion. In reply to the question, "Who shall be judge whether the prince or the legislative power acts contrary to its trust?" he answers: "The people shall be judge. For who shall be judge whether his trustee or deputy acts rightly and according to the trust reposed in him, but he who deputes him?"[4] Locke also held that all the power of civil government relates only to the civil interests, is limited to the things of this world, and has no concern with the world to come.[5]

The Philosophical Movement in Germany

In Germany, the social philosophy offered nothing original. But metaphysics, from Wolff to Kant, and religious criticism, from Semler to Goethe, turned in the direction of a revolutionary naturalism.

---

[2] "What I attack is the idea of English science, which is not lofty or philosophical. There they judge science merely by its practical results and its civilizing effects. This way of viewing science is unsafe. It is as if, for establishing morality, we should confine ourselves to setting forth the advantages it procures for society." E. Renan, *L'avenir de la science,* p. 22.

[3] Cf. Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale* (2nd ed.), II, 266–306. Hobbes' ideas are set forth in his *De cive* and his *Leviathan.*

[4] Locke, *Of Civil Government,* Bk. II, chap. 19, no. 240.

[5] This is the principle of his *Epistola de tolerantia,* which appeared in 1689.

Christian Wolff, who undertook the task of summarizing the philosophy of Leibnitz and pushing it to its ultimate consequences, taught that God cannot be man's end and that society should be organized merely in view of an earthly end. The popular acclaim given to his writings was extreme; the study of his doctrines was made obligatory for all candidates who presented themselves for theological degrees. The invasion of Wolffianism into German theology was disastrous. On the pretext of scientific thought, many persons attenuated Christian dogma; others abandoned it entirely and accepted no laws but those of reason, those of free choice.[6]

Later on we find Kant deriving his inspiration from Rousseau in his individual and his social doctrine. Rousseau's "conscience" becomes the "categorical imperative" of Kant's practical reason; the general principles of the *Social Contract* dictate Kant's whole political system. Those principles are that of "the general will" considered as the sole source of the laws and that of the distinction, in each individual, between the "citizen lawmaker" and the subject.

German religious thought, which appealed to the authority of Scripture, regarded by Protestantism as the only source of revelation, developed in the direction of an autonomous naturalism. In 1771 Semler proposed a new criterion for establishing the canon of the Bible: to accept as inspired by God only the books producing a moral betterment. In 1777, the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments,* edited by Lessing but composed by Samuel Reimarus, a professor at Hamburg, absolutely denied miracles, particularly the miracle of Christ's resurrection, and declared the impossibility of a divine revelation. Shortly afterward, in a personal work, the drama of *Nathan der Weise,* Lessing clearly professed religious indifferentism.

---

[6] Hergenröther, *op. cit.* (4th ed.), Bk. II, Part II, chap. 13.

On the ruins heaped up by radical naturalism, in Germany then developed a visionary pantheism which received the name of Illuminism. Herder, Goethe, and Schiller, in different degrees, may be considered its most illustrious representatives. Johann Gottfried Herder, poet and philosopher gifted with a mighty imagination, in his *Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* preached a vague and grandiose religion, with ill-defined dogmas, almost identical with the worship of humanity. Goethe, failing to see anything higher than the ancient Hellenism and earthly beauty, deified plastic beauty and the satisfaction of the senses. Schiller who, at the close of his days, was not far removed from Christian ideas and became almost Catholic, bemoaned the death of the gods of Greece and Rome.

The Philosophical Movement in Italy

Italy likewise had its social utopia in Campanella's *Civitas Solis*. More's *Utopia* is a popular republic; Campanella's *Civitas Solis* is a theocratic republic. At the summit of the state is the metaphysician, a sort of "good tyrant" whose office is to enforce the sway of reason; beneath are three magistrates (Might, Love, and Wisdom), applying the prescriptions of Reason. The function of the first is the national defense; that of the second to watch over the development of the population; the third has charge of the progress of the sciences and the arts. In the *Civitas Solis* the communism goes beyond that of the *Utopia*. It includes not only property, but also the women and the family.

More restrained in his plan of reform, but more precise in his demands, Marquis Cesare Beccaria of Milan simply gathers together, a hundred years later, in his *Tratto dei delitti e delle pene* and in his work on agriculture and manufactures, all the appeals that had been disseminated during a century in a countless number of pamphlets and large volumes. Avoiding the use of trifling expressions and digressions, he lays down several of the principles that later, with the doctrines of Adam Smith, constituted the liberal political economy. For Beccaria the best social organization is the one that produces the largest amount of useful labor. By useful labor he means that which gives the greatest quantity of negotiable products. He analyzes the real functions of productive capital and the vicissitudes of the population. He recommends the division of labor and proposes a decimal system based on the system of the world. But, with most of the economists of the time, he declares that manufacturing is barren. A peaceful and even timid man, Beccaria took little part in the agitations of the world; but his ideas exercised a notable influence on men's minds.

Almost at the same time as Beccaria's work on agriculture, in Italy, under the title of *Scienza della legislazione,* a great work appeared which, in a vigorous, picturesque, even theatrical style, embraced not only political economy, but also public and private law, the family, education, and religion. This book was the work of a young man, thirty years old, Gaetano Filangieri of Naples, who died six years later without seeing his utopias evaporate before the lessons of experience. Filangieri's aim was to reform humanity from top to bottom. For the realization of his projects he counted on the unlimited power of the laws and of authority. According to him, authority gives birth to the geniuses and creates the philosophers. A ruler, merely by pressing the mainspring of honor, can form legions of Scipios and Reguluses. He would concentrate all the social functions in the hands of the prince, whose authority he wished to see enter everywhere. Filangieri and other Italian writers of the time, being without experience in political affairs, indulged in fanciful schemes that failed to appreciate the practical obstacles in the way of their abstract maxims.[7]

An Italian poet spread the revolutionary ideas among the common people. Alfieri of Asti was an aristocrat enamored of the abstract liberty then being preached. He boasted that he scorned Rousseau and the philosophers, but he imitated them. In him every sentiment turned into passion, every passion into frenzy; a frenzy of study, of love, of liberty. In his political comedies his humor consisted in showing the heroes on their prosaic and grotesque side. In *La tirannide* he exaggerated Rousseau's doctrines, attacked the arts and industry, proclaimed that Christians were more enslaved than were the Orientals, and advised everyone to come to an agreement not to obey the despots. In one of his plays, he puts on the lips of a jester of Philip II this question: "What would Your Majesty do if, when you say Yes, everyone else should say No?" He witnessed the Revolution, but did not grasp its import. Death came to him in 1803, after he had dedicated several of his tragedies to posterity.[8]

---

[7] Cf. Cesare Cantu, *Storia dei cent' anni, 1750–1850.*

The Philosophical Movement in Holland

Like sunny Italy, foggy Holland had its authoritarians and its republicans, its partisans of the "good tyrant" and its abettors of anarchy. The difference separating one party from the other was less than may appear at first sight. The former appealed to the authority of the jurist Grotius; the latter claimed the authority of the philosopher Spinoza. Both aspired to a complete regeneration of society.

Grotius is known especially as the one who revived the law of nations. Although his fame on this point is overrated, for he was preceded by the Dominican Vittoria,[9] therein lies his true title to renown. But Grotius was also concerned with the renewal of political and social institutions; and his ideas, systematically arranged and explained by his disciple Pufendorf, inspired the policy of Joseph II. His conclusions were not unlike those of Hobbes; but his procedure was quite different. What the English thinker examined as a philosopher, the Dutch thinker studies as a jurist. Grotius treats the questions of the natural law by the maxims of the civil law. The civil law which he invoked is that of ancient Rome. With a text of the jurist Paulus he decides the question of the origin of property;[10] and again following Paulus, he solves the problem of sovereignty by an argument of analogy with the Roman tutorage. He says: "There is no reason why civil governments should not exist that are established for the advantage of the sovereign. Even when the establishment of the government has taken place in the interest of the subjects, this condition would not require in consequence the superiority of the people over the sovereign, for nobody considers that the pupil should be above the teacher."[11]

---

[8] Arthur Graf, in his well documented work, *L'Anglomania in Italia* (Turin, 1911), shows that Alfieri and the Italian writers of the eighteenth century, generally owe much to the English influence.

[9] See his *De jure belli.*

Spinoza is a philosopher, and his metaphysics, at least at first glance, presents a certain principle of grandeur and dignity, which is quite absent from the metaphysics of Hobbes. According to Spinoza, man is not merely a part of nature, he is a part of the Divinity. But, as some have held that the Amsterdam philosopher is "intoxicated with God," and others that he is basically atheistic, his political and social doctrine evidently contains a fundamental ambiguity. To one of his friends, Spinoza wrote: "What distinguishes my political views from those of Hobbes is that I preserve the natural law, even in the civil state, and that I grant the sovereign rights over the subjects only according to the measure of his power."[12] But if the natural law is preserved, how is force the measure of the right; and if force is the measure of right, how does the natural law remain? However this may be, Spinoza's doctrine differs essentially from that of Hobbes in its spirit. Hobbes requires of the state nothing more than order and peace. What Spinoza demands of it is first of all liberty. He says that if we give the name of peace to slavery, barbarism, and solitude, then peace is the most wretched thing in the world. Peace, however, does not consist merely in the absence of war, but in the union of spirits and in concord.[13] On the question of the advantages of monarchy, he is in direct opposition to the English philosopher. He says: "Some think that if the power is given to a single man, it will be stronger. This view is wrong. A single man has not the strength to support so great a burden: hence he will have counselors who will govern for him; and this government, which has an appearance of being monarchical, will in practice be an aristocracy, but a hidden aristocracy, and thereby the worst of all. Furthermore, if the king is a child, an invalid, or aged, he is king only in name; often, when impelled by his passion, he leaves the power in the hands of a mistress or a favorite courtier." [14]

---

[10] Grotius, *De jure pacis et belli,* Bk. II, chap. 3, § 3.

[11] *Ibid.,* Bk. I, chap. 3, § 15.

[12] Spinoza, *Epist.* 25.

Thus from one end of Europe to the other a general unrest stirred men's minds. Reform plans of vastest scope, the most rash, the most general, the most hateful, the most subversive, and the most revolutionary, arose on all sides, stirring an enthusiasm the more lively since they were often vague as a dream, rallying to their support a number of minds as great as generally they were ambiguous: abstract and calculating, under a scientific and precise appearance, pagan and mystical, glorifying in turn despotism and anarchy, tracing everything to man and nature, and making of man and nature a sort of divinity. But this widespread excitation had a center, France, toward which, since the "great century," all the thinkers of Europe persistently turned their eyes.

---

[13] Spinoza, *Tractat. polit.*, § 4.

[14] *Ibid.*, chap. 6, § 5, 8.

French Philosophers

An endless subject of discussion is provided by the question of the influence exercised by France and the influence exercised upon France in the spread of the revolutionary ideas. But we may be certain that, where an outside influence is evident, the French expression of it finally prevailed. The success of this formulation of the ideas was owing to the clearer, more ingenious, or more eloquent turn that it took. In this respect, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopedists are truly the fathers of the Revolution.

We have already studied the history of their predecessors.[15] The Renaissance of ancient literature had, in many souls, brought about a revival of the pagan spirit. Pantheistic or atheistic rationalism, which in the Middle Ages appeared under the form of Averroism and Illuminism, gradually assumed the form of radical unbelief. This rationalism was spread quietly by the semi-rationalism of Faustus Socinus, which attacked the divinity of Christ and even the nature of God. The movement was also furthered by the literary skepticism of Rabelais, the changing and varied dilettantism of Montaigne, the political indifferentism of Michael de l'Hospital, the theoretical Epicureanism of Gassendi, and the exaggerated cultivation of science and the laws of nature as set forth by the school of Descartes and brilliantly interpreted by Fontenelle. This same movement was also affected by the harmful influence of that increasing group of reckless spirits who were pardoned everything by the salons of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and who alarmed not only the orthodoxy of Father Garasse and Father Mersenne but also the good sense of Nicole and Leibnitz. Naturalism had thus leaped over the various stages that led from Petrarch to Voltaire, from humanism to philosophism, from the college of apostolic secretaries to the salon of Ninon de Lenclos, and from the movement of the Renaissance to that of the *Encyclopedia.*

---

[15] Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* VI, 499 ff.

We have already spoken of this vast undertaking, which brought together men of the most diverse views—atheists and deists, revolutionists and conservatives, individualist economists like Turgot and communist economists like Mably. But this same undertaking found its unity in an identical inspiration, belief in the supremacy of reason.

These men met one another in the salons of high society. The salons of the seventeenth century had produced psychologists; those of the eighteenth century produced philosophers, or at least men who called themselves philosophers. In the list of the subscribers of the *Encyclopedia,* we find the greatest names of France.

In the course of the eighteenth century the literary people used to meet especially in the salons of two women well known for the looseness of their morals and the freedom of their spirit: the notorious Ninon de Lenclos and the extravagant Madame de Tencin. So fashionable was the frequenting of the salon of Ninon de Lenclos that we find there the most distinguished persons of the royal court and such celebrities as Saint-Evremond, Guy-Patin, Molière, La Fare, and Chaulieu. Abbé de Châteauneuf there presented his godson, François Arouet. Ninon was so impressed by the mind of this young man that she bequeathed to him 2,000 francs for the purchase of books for his library.

Voltaire (1694–1778)

Thus began the fame of François Arouet de Voltaire. This renown was like that of most of his contemporaries. To be launched by a salon was the surest means of attaining fame. For budding reputations the salon was in those days what the press is today.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

In a general history of the Church we have no need to relate in detail the life of Voltaire. But the part this man played in the strife against Catholicism requires that we briefly take note of his person and his work. Voltaire did incalculable harm. Few characters have been more contemptible than his, and even his writings are a strange mixture of literary values. But he possessed an undeniable power of seduction. He was representative of a whole group of minds, and he exercised on his age an incomparable influence.

The first part of his life, until 1746, was devoted to acquiring a reputation. While still a youth he succeeded in widely extending his relationships. College students, eminent people of the world, literary people, persons of the business world, actors, in all these circles he counted his friends. He engaged in every form of writing: epic poetry in his *Henriade,* tragic poetry in his *Œdipe* or his *Zaïre,* didactic poetry in the *Epistles* or the *Discourses on Man,* history in his *Charles XII,* scholarly writing in the *Memoirs* that he composed for the Academy of Sciences, philosophy in his *Lettres anglaises* and his *Essay on the Philosophy of Newton.* His ambition was to be the teacher and guide of the minds of his time.

His ideas are summed up in three essential works: the *Epîtres à Uranie* (1722–31), the *Philosophical Letters* (1733–34), and the *Discourses on Man* (1734–38). The first of these works proposes deism or natural religion in opposition to revealed religion; the second exalts the idea of science; the third popularizes a number of ideas current in English philosophy, such as the idea that virtue is measured by the degree of social usefulness, and the progress of mankind by the development of the arts and of life. In short, Voltaire nowhere shows himself an original thinker. But in a lucid, incisive, and unequaled popular style, he presents under a form easily grasped the ideas scattered in the world of the libertines, the venturous minds, and the innovators of every sort. Voltaire sets forth in detail and explains the great discoveries, the great hypotheses of the human mind. He parades before his readers' astonished eyes—but with distortion, caricature, and ridicule—the great men of sacred and profane history, the ancient religions, the old legends. The Frenchmen of his time discussed these books, pamphlets, treatises, novels, histories, and dictionaries, in which all human knowledge, all reviews of the past, all the disputes of the day, and all dreams about the future were gathered together in lively phrases, in sparkling metaphors, in familiar proverbs, and in indecent anecdotes. "I have done more in my time," said Voltaire, "than Luther and Calvin did in theirs." At least he had in common with the two Protestant Reformers this trait, that he finally aggravated all the ills of his time.

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778)

Voltaire was only a destroyer. Jean Jacques Rousseau wished to be a reconstructor. Taine, with his habitual vigor, has depicted the dominating powers of "this man of the people, ill suited to the elegant world, ill at ease in a salon, ill born, ill brought up, stained by his wretched and precocious experience, sick in soul and body, carrying the defilement of his temperament even into his austere morality and into his purest idyls. He was alien, Protestant, at once philanthropic and misanthropic, dwelling in an ideal world which he had erected into something quite the reverse of the real world." [16] Yet this man would exercise over his contemporaries and especially over generations to come, an influence greater than that of Voltaire. In fact, the latter was effective only by satire; Rousseau was particularly captivating by his fancies. He was not merely an amusing comedian, he was a magician who charms, a man of passion who draws others in his train. He spoke of conscience, of duty, of Providence, of the Gospels, of Christ "whose death was that of a God, as the death of Socrates was that of a sage." All this he did with a contagious warmth, in a style overflowing, virile, forcible, impetuous, vibrant, and sonorous.

---

[16] Taine, *L'ancien régime,* II, 104–7.

Le Play has denounced the false dogmas bestowed on the Revolution by Rousseau. These doctrines are three in number: the dogmas of man's original perfection, of man's providential equality, and of the right of revolt; and are found set forth in three chief works: the *Discourse on Inequality,* the *Social Contract,* and *Emile.*

Outraged at the miseries of the present world, Rousseau imagines a perfect state, which he supposes was and must have been the natural and primitive state of mankind. He built up his ideal man out of whole cloth, a man such as must have come forth from the hands of the Creator. This man is strong and agile, able to triumph over all the obstacles of nature; the passions have not changed his harmonious constitution; a rare delicacy of the senses, a feeling of conservation, an instinct of goodness, and a natural sobriety assured him of tranquillity and happiness. Rousseau writes: "I see him sitting down under an oak, quenching his thirst at the first brook, finding his repose under the same tree as furnished his repast; and thus all his needs are satisfied." [17] The society of the eighteenth century, so artificial, so polished, so complex, but suffering from that very complexity, contemplated this ideal man with delight and surprise and, by the very contrast, became enamored of him. "By this contrast," says Taine, "Rousseau found himself so forcible. He showed the dawn to people who never rose from bed before noon. In a society where life consisted in strutting gracefully according to a set manner, he preached the return to nature, independence, a life active, earnest, happy, and free, in the light of day and in the open air." [18]

---

[17] *Discours sur l'inégalité,* Part I (1864 ed.), I, 536.

[18] *L'ancien régime,* II, 110.

Rousseau could easily show that in this primitive state of original perfection providential equality prevailed. The less human nature was developed, the less it took account of differences between men. The most natural and the most equal state is that of the germ. Inequality is, then, the work of civilization, of the passage from the state of nature to the social state. Work created property, property created inequality, and inequality gave rise to the social organization, which by its laws established the domination of the strong and the servitude of the weak. Rousseau said: "Such was and such must have been the origin of society and of laws, that provided new shackles for the weak and new power for the rich, permanently destroyed natural liberty, fixed the law of property and inequality, and, for the advantage of some, thenceforth subjected the whole human race to labor, to servitude, to wretchedness." [19]

In these terrible words is found the sentiment that would supply Rousseau with the third of his "false dogmas," the dogma of the perpetual right to revolt. The people have, first of all, the right and the duty to revolt against the social state which he showed had an unjust origin. He says: "For man to give up his liberty is to give up his quality of being man." [20] Even when the people, in conditions which the philosopher carefully determines, have stipulated a social contract, this contract does not oblige. The people are sovereign, and a sovereign cannot bind himself except toward himself. "It is against the nature of the body politic for the sovereign to impose on himself a law that he is unable to break: whence we see that no fundamental law, not even the social contract, can be obligatory for the body of the people." [21]

Such a theory so excessively flattered the passions of a soft and corrupt society that it found therein great acceptance. With most men of the Revolution, we find a surprising contrast between their idyllic dreams and their bloody acts, a contrast that is explained by Rousseau's doctrine. These utopias of the Constituent Assembly and the massacres of the Terror are connected with the *Discourse on Inequality* and the *Social Contract*. The ideologist and the Jacobin would find their views in Jean Jacques Rousseau.[22] In his writing as in the work of the Revolution, the idyl gave birth to tragedy.

---

[19] *Op. cit.*, I, 558.

[20] *Contrat social,* Bk. I, chap. 4.

[21] *Ibid.*, chap. 7.

Influence of the New Theories

The revolutionary doctrines spread the more easily as they found powerful auxiliaries among the Gallicans and the Jansenists, incomparable aid in Freemasonry, and accomplices even in the Church.

We have already noted how the Jansenism and the parliamentary Gallicanism of the eighteenth century, while firmly determined to remain in the Church, had been led to take an attitude clearly revolutionary.[23] The religious policy of Joseph II in Germany and the attitude of the Synod of Pistoia in Italy were the last stages of that evolution. These two events exercised a notable influence over men's minds.

"During the second half of the eighteenth century, not only theology, but the faith itself underwent a profound decline. The old methods no longer exercised any attraction; the new ideas brought honors and advantages; the novel doctrines were expressed in a sparkling style that fascinated people." [24] By a phenomenon that is met more than once in the history of apologetics, defections took place among the most earnest opponents of the current errors. Some Benedictines and some Jesuits, through studying the aberrations of Josephism with a view to refuting them, had let themselves be taken in by their sophisms. Furthermore, too much emphasis was given to the sole aim of refuting the adversaries. Thus the studies of the Catholics became dependent on those of the Protestants; all continuity with the great preceding era was broken; rationalist, Jansenist, and revolutionary elements penetrated Catholic literature; theology took the tone of the philosophy of the time; attempts were made, by transforming it in a more "rational" sense, to put it in the current of the so-called progress. In 1774 the Benedictine Rautenstrauch, director of the faculty of theology at Vienna, prescribed the abandonment of the scholastic dryness to give more importance to exegetical, patristic, and historical studies.

---

[22] On Rousseau, see J. Lemaitre, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau,* and Faguet, *Vie de Rousseau.* On the philosophers of the eighteenth century in general, see, besides the works of Taine and Roustan, the following: Faguet, *Le XVIIIe siècle;* J. Fabre, *Les pères de la Révolution,* favorable to the philosophers; for a different view, Tornézy, *La legende des philosophes.*

[23] Mourret, *op. cit.;* see Vol. VI, Index.

[24] Hergenröther, *op. cit.,* Vol. VII, Bk. II, Part II, chap. 14.

Soon prudent men could see that the new regulation had merely favored frivolity and caprice, especially when Emperor Joseph II proclaimed liberty of conscience and liberty of the press. The exegete Christopher Fischer and the scholar Jahn were notable for their doctrinal boldness; the historian Dannenmayr published a manual of history filled with prejudices against the Holy See. A Vienna ecclesiastical review, the *Wiener Kirchenzeitung,* took for its motto, "To work for the progress of the earliest Christianity and of the most modern philosophy." A former Jesuit, Joannes Yung, professor at Mainz, remained faithful to Catholic dogma, but he favored the novelties in discipline; a Friar Minor, Philip Hedderich, insulted the Apostolic See in his lectures on canon law; a Benedictine, Andrew Spitz, took his inspiration from the same spirit in his lectures on history; another Friar Minor, Elias Van den Schüren, taught a pure subjectivism. The Bishop of Trier sanctioned with his approbation the most dubious theories. Many Bavarian Benedictines openly embraced the doctrines of Wolff; others, the doctrines of Kant.

These dissolving influences reached the ranks of the lower clergy and even the laity. Some priests who, under the Josephist regime, sat beside the young Protestant pastors at the lectures of the theologian Paulus and whom the state wished to make good "teachers of the people" rather than ministers of God, became, as someone has said, "the interpreters, always banal even though elegant, of a natural ethics, half-rationalist and half perfumed with incense." [25]

Their "enlightened" catechisms preached a sort of higher morality, purposely leaving in the shadow the fundamental mysteries of Christianity: original sin, the Incarnation, and the redemption.[26] In the presence of this German Church, which blushed for its dogmas, which veiled or dissimulated, with shame and embarrassment, its most traditional patrimony and its most essential reason for existence, German rationalism felt its arrogance increase. Those who followed the lead of the French philosophers and those who jealously defended the autonomy of German thought were at least agreed on the decline of Catholicism. "The Church of Rome," said Herder, "no longer resembles anything but an old ruin, where no new life can enter." In like vein, Nicolaï said: "Only among the superstitious populace can the Roman faith be prolonged; before science, before culture, it will no longer exist." [27]

The secret society of the Illuminati, founded (March 1, 1776) by a professor of canon law, Adam Weishaupt, found a terrain well prepared for its recruitment. This society pretended to reveal "the hidden meaning of the doctrines of the great teacher of Nazareth"; it pretended to give the true significance of the dogmas of original sin, of the redemption, and of grace.

---

[25] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse,* I, 162.

[26] Abbé Baston, a canon of Rouen, exiled by the Revolution, has left us a picture of those Westphalian priests who frequented the inns and said Mass wearing boots. They were well enough educated and upon the whole they were virtuous; but in matters of ceremonies they were without any propriety. Baston, *Mémoires,* II, 275 and *passim.*

[27] Quoted by Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

According to Weishaupt, those dogmas signified simply that man, fallen from his primitive state of probity and liberty by the violence of his instincts and passions, and having degenerated into barbarism, was imperfectly liberated by the work of the priests, of the scholars, and of the statesmen, and would be freed completely by the effort of his own reason, by the consciousness of his own dignity, and by the free use of his own strength. These tenets were the very principles of Rousseau, elaborated by the mystical brain of a German.

In 1784 the Illuminati imprudently made public their internal dissensions: on February 11, 1785, Weishaupt was removed from his office of professor; he withdrew to the home of Duke Ernest of Gotha. Several of his followers were exiled or imprisoned. Most of them already had relations with the secret society of the Freemasons. These relations became more intimate, but without ending in complete fusion. The society founded by Weishaupt continued to spread with increased precautions and reserve.[28]

In France the Jansenist dispute had ended in disastrous consequences for the Church and for society. "In one sense it inflicted greater harm than Protestantism, because the Jansenist error was better adapted to the French temperament of the eighteenth century; it was more dissimulated and clever." [29] In sharply criticizing the traditions and the persons of the Church, the Jansenists had opened the way for the raillery and the negations of the Encyclopedists. Moreover, by stirring up endless disputes, they had turned the defenders of the Church aside from more serious and fruitful labors. On January 26, 1762, Voltaire wrote: "The Jesuits and the Jansenists continue to tear each other with sharp teeth; we must shoot at them while they are engaged in biting each other." [30]

---

[28] On this whole movement in Germany, see Hergenröther, *op. cit.,* Vol. VII, Bk. II, Part II, chap. 14.

[29] J. Bourlon, *Les Assemblées du Clergé et le Jansénisme.*

[30] Voltaire, letter 3517 to D'Argenthal; Lefèvre ed., LX, 143. Cf. p. 139.

Unfortunately the constituted authorities showed themselves more and more favorable to the sect. The parliaments, always censorious, became its more or less avowed defenders in many circumstances. In 1723, King Louis XV refused to create the independent and impartial tribunal which the Assembly of the Clergy had requested to judge the religious disputes. In 1725 the prime minister, the Duke of Bourbon, abruptly had the dissolution of the assembly decreed just as it was about to condemn the Jansenist libels, and the Duke even erased from the records of its sessions a note regarding the sending of a letter of protest to the King. Finally, in 1762, indirectly but not less injurious to the interests of religion, the government of Louis XV became the active accomplice of the judiciary *coup d'état* which abolished the Society of Jesus in France and thus removed the mightiest adversary of schism and unbelief.

Ever since Henry IV the Jesuits were the ones who had educated generations that were the most devoted to the Holy See. The sophisms and the unsound practices of the false disciples of St. Augustine had no hold on minds trained by the Jesuits, for they vigorously combated rationalism and naturalism without ignoring the legitimate rights of nature and reason. When they disappeared from the scene, they were replaced by congregations, like the Oratory, the doctrinaires, and the Benedictines of St. Maur, who were more and more imbued with Jansenism and sometimes, especially toward the end, with revolutionary philosophy. The mild stubbornness of Rollin had anchored the Paris University itself deeply in lamentable errors that even admired the convulsionary "miracles."

Although religious teaching did not disappear from the colleges at the end of the eighteenth century, we can say that religion was often presented there under an altered and ridiculous form which naturally made the students, who were entrapped in the impiety of the age, consider religion with disgust and aversion. The extravagant worship of the deacon Pâris was confounded with real piety, of which this devotion was merely a sacrilegious parody. And as the abstention from the sacraments dried up the piety of the purest souls, "the ancient faith of the nation, a victim of both feverishness and anemia, was declining along with the morals; the national religion appeared superficially like a citadel of early times, half ruined, stripped of its best soldiers, occupied by invalids, many of them in a state of intoxication, and, in spite of the immense population still living under its shelter, unable to resist the enraged assaults of the passions and of the reasonings combined against it. The barbarians could now enter and celebrate their insolent and tragic triumph on these ruins.[31]

The Clergy

This triumph was the easier as the revolutionary spirit found accomplices in the souls of those very ones who reckoned themselves among the most submissive sons of the Church or who professed to be the most loyal supports of tradition. Such venerable priests, who with all their might rejected the Jansenist doctrines condemned by the Church, felt its hidden influence, approached the sacraments with trembling timidity, kept the faithful from the sacraments, and thus took from them the surest means of living the Christian life and of defending it against its enemies. Some others, too imprudently although in a spirit of zeal, had read the publications of the time and had unconsciously absorbed their poison. True, the germs of religion which a strong Catholic education had sowed in their hearts remained deeply rooted there, even under the dust of contrary germs. But slowly, gently, without thought of treason, without hypocrisy, in these priestly souls the entrance of supernatural inspirations became more difficult, whereas that of the pseudo-philosophical and vaguely humanitarian speculations grew apace. A certain fact is characteristic of this state of soul. Pierre de La Gorce says:

> In many cities of France, Masonic lodges were established. Their names have a certain sameness: Egalité, Sincérité, Parfaite Union,

---

[31] Gautherot, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

> Parfaite Amitié. At these lodges poetry was read, music was played, and collections were taken up for the needy. The program was that religion should not be mentioned; but they flayed superstition, in which they included everything that the veneration of men has proclaimed sacred. . . . Who would have expected to meet priests at these meetings? Yet some were there. At Béthune several priests belonged to the lodge; at Besançon among the members were some Bernardines, a Carmelite, and five canons of the chapter.[32]

On July 15, 1778, Archbishop Conzié of Tours, a prelate quite free from prejudices, writing to Archbishop de Brienne, regarded as ridiculous the charge brought against a Cordelier who had joined the Masons. "It has seemed to me," he said, "very amusing that the great reproach of Seigneur Saint-Luc[33] against this religious is that he is a Freemason."

Not many priests were Freemasons. In 1775 the Assembly of the Clergy had approved an association of writers and theologians founded to combat unbelief. In 1782 the defenders of the good cause were recommended to the munificence of the minister of the press; a sum of 40,000 livres was subscribed for the republication, after Bossuet's works, of those of Fénelon. But these measures came too late. In 1778 Voltaire's coming to Paris had been an occasion for a sort of apotheosis. In the salons the philosophers were the masters of the conversation. The Jansenists, who had them condemned by the Parliament, read their writings in secret and were delighted at seeing them avenge their old grudges. At the court the Encyclopedists found powerful friends. According to a historian favorable to the philosophers of the eighteenth century, "Madame de Pompadour was for them more than an ally; she was a genuine friend."[34] She was the one who prevented the publication of Dupin's criticism of Montesquieu.

---

[32] De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* I, 63–65.

[33] That is, Bishop Conen de Saint-Luc of Quimper.

[34] Roustan, *op. cit.,* p. 97.

The authority of the Most Christian King slowly started moving to repress these disturbances of the religious and social order. Many Catholics then wondered if the greatness of the danger had not been exaggerated. Perhaps these criticisms of the philosophers did not have the import attributed to them. On July 17, 1787, De Montmorin, the minister of foreign affairs, wishing to calm the anxieties of the Pope, wrote to Cardinal de Bernis, French ambassador at Rome, that, since the death of Voltaire the books against religion were hardly being read at all. In that same year Abbé Bertola concluded his philosophy of history with these words: "Few reforms remain to be done. They will take place peacefully. As for a revolution, Europe no longer need fear any." [35]

We have thus reached the year 1789, which would be decisive for the history of Europe and of the whole world.

Before relating the tragic vicissitudes of the French Revolution, we must turn our attention to the Supreme Pontiff of the Church, who would have the heavy responsibility of steering the bark of Peter through the great storm.

[35] Quoted by Cantu, *op. cit.*, II, 48.

CHAPTER III

The First Years of the Pontificate of Pius VI (1775–89)

The pope who took possession of the see of St. Peter (February 15, 1775) under the name of Pius VI seemed in no way prepared to withstand a revolution. On the contrary, everything apparently had destined him to govern the Church gloriously in an era of peace and prosperity.

Pius VI

The new pope was a tall man of majestic bearing, a friend of festivities and ceremonies that brought him into contact with his people; he was benevolent, generous, with a sincere worthiness of life and piety, which always inspired respect in the minds of the most ill-willed. He seemed to be one of those whose names are transmitted to future generations with the epithets of Good, Magnificent, or Magnanimous. A scion of the noble family of the Braschi, he had acquired the fondness of the masses and the esteem of the influential in the various offices he held: administrator of the diocese of Ostia and Velletri, private secretary of Benedict XIV, treasurer of the Apostolic Camera, cardinal, and commendatory abbot of Subiaco.[1]

Says the most recent biographer of Pius VI: "I do not know if, in the history of the Church, any pope saw his reign open under such happy auspices, and his coming greeted with so much enthusiasm by the whole Catholic world." [2] The republics vied with the kings; the prince electors with the sovereigns. Empress Maria Theresa did not wait for the official notification of the election before sending her felicitations to the common father of the faithful; and the emperor of the Romans, Joseph II, in a long letter written by his own hand, assured the Pope of his joy and devotedness.[3]

---

[1] See Jules Gendry, *Pie VI, sa vie, son pontificat,* I, 1–65. This work, published in 1906, is based on the Vatican archives and various other unpublished documents.

The new pontiff was in the full vigor of mature years.[4] His soul opened to the most grandiose projects. The affairs that had engaged the pontificates of Clement XIII and Clement XIV seemed to be settled. The disputes that had arisen with the house of France ended with the re-establishment of the sovereignty of the Holy See over Comtat Venaissin. The Pope's first projects were directed to the prosperity and embellishment of the Papal States.

Many pontiffs, from Boniface VIII to Clement XIII, had tried to make habitable the extensive plains which, under the name of Pontine Marshes, thirty-six miles long and twelve miles wide along the coast of the Mediterranean, were in such condition that agriculture was impossible there. Pius VI appealed to the cooperation of all to assure the success of this vast enterprise. In the spring of 1780 we see him, accompanied by some persons of his suite, encourage by his presence the 3,500 workmen engaged in the drainage of the stagnant waters; for ten years each spring he watched over these gigantic works and stimulated the workmen.

The great expenses thus occasioned prompted the Pope to introduce a drastic economy in the management of the public funds. While he had been treasurer of the Apostolic Camera, he gave proofs of his vigilance and of his firmness in the government of the Treasury.[5] The financial regime introduced into the Papal States by Sixtus V [6] had been powerless to save them from the distress which all the national economies of Europe were experiencing at that time.[7] The vigor with which the Pope repressed the malpractices, which included those of the prefect of the Congregation of the Annona,[8] Nicholas Bischi, inspired a salutary fear in all the employees of the Treasury Office.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[3] For the text of this letter, cf. *ibid.*, p. 489.

[4] Pius VI, at the time of his elevation, was fifty-seven years old. Some remarked that no pope of his years had ever been elected who enjoyed sturdy health equal to his. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 106.

While treasurer of the Apostolic Camera, Cardinal Braschi had been authorized to create, for the assemblage of the masterpieces of sculpture, a museum called the Clementine Museum. Upon becoming pope, he urged the excavations required to discover the treasures of art buried in the Roman soil and he enlarged the museum destined to receive them. Eleven fine halls, among them the Belvedere, the Gallery of the Statues, the open loggia, and the Sala a croce graeca, were restored or constructed by order of Pius VI. The new museum, one of the richest of Europe, rightly then took the name of Pio-Clementine Museum.

The Pope's Popularity

The people, who for a long time had seen only popes bent under the weight of years, acclaimed this pontiff of robust appearance, majestic bearing, smiling countenance, and firm and dignified step. They could not restrain the expression of their joy as he passed, "How handsome he is!" The frugality of his life and the purity of his morals made them add, "He is as holy as he is handsome." The Jews, whose requests he generously granted by allowing them to leave the confines of their ghetto during the night,[9] by authorizing them to bury their dead according to their own rites, and by correcting the injustices by which they had sometimes been oppressed, joined their acclamations to those of the Christians. Furthermore, the most devoted friends of the Jesuits, the Zelanti, as they were called, were gratified, for the most part, with the new pope's attitude toward the Society of Jesus, by whom he had been educated. Pius VI, in spite of the insistence of the Spanish diplomacy,[10] disapproved of the proceedings that had been previously followed against the Jesuits. He called these proceedings "a mystery of impiety";[11] in the face of much opposition, he had decided on the liberation of the Jesuit fathers who were imprisoned in the Castle Sant' Angelo. Unfortunately this decision, which freed the assistants of Father Ricci, no longer found the general of the Society alive. Father Ricci had died on November 24, 1775, protesting under oath and in the presence of the sacred host which was brought to him on his deathbed, that he had not deserved the prison where he was about to die. Pius VI ordered a solemn funeral for him and decided that he should be buried in the church of the Gesu as his predecessors had been.[12]

---

[5] We find related that the employees of the Treasury used to say of him: "Our treasurer has a good nose for scenting and teeth for biting."

[6] Mourret, *op. cit.*, V, 538; Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 123.

[7] Cardinal de Bernis wrote: "All Europe is sick; all its finances are in disorder." Quoted by Masson, *Le Cardinal de Bernis*, p. 122.

[8] The prefect of the Annona had charge of provisions, the markets, and food allowances.

The schismatical and heretical sovereigns entertained courteous and deferential relations with the Supreme Pontiff. Empress Catherine II of Russia, who had energetically refused to publish in her states the decree of suppression of the Jesuits, obtained from Pius VI, in 1778, a secret approbation (for Russia) of the suppressed Order.[13] Shortly afterward (1783) Catherine received with the greatest honors the apostolic nuncio, Archetti, who was provided with all powers to regulate the religious affairs. On this occasion the Pope officially recognized the title of emperor given to the sovereigns of Russia. In that same year King Gustavus III of Sweden came to Rome to see the Pope and confirmed the edict issued two years earlier to assure the Catholics the free exercise of their worship, and he accepted the sending to Stockholm of a vicar apostolic. The next year the Church in the United States, recently freed from England, obtained from the Holy Father the appointment of a vicar apostolic to govern the Catholics of that country. Five years later (1789), when the government of the American Union was established, Pius VI had the joy of placing at the head of the Catholic hierarchy in America, on the episcopal see of Baltimore, a holy prelate, Bishop Carroll, a personal friend of Washington.

---

[9] The law which ordered the closing of the gates of the ghetto every night was prompted by the desire of protection from the Jews and also with a view to protecting the Jews themselves from the hatred of the people.

[10] Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

[11] Hergenröther, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, chap. 3, § 1.

[12] *Ibid.* But Pius VI persistently refused to annul Clement XIV's decree of suppression of the Jesuits. He even condemned the writings that were published against that decree. See *Bullarium* (Barberi ed.), VI, 332, 347. To Ricci have been attributed the words, *"Sint ut sunt, aut non sint."* But the saying was not his. We find it, at least in substance, in a letter of Clement XIII to Louis XV (January 28, 1762). Cf. Boero, *Osservazioni sopra del pontificato di Clemente XIV* (2 vols., 1853), II, 15.

The Danger of Philosophism

All this occurred at the moment when the revolutionary movement, let loose in France and ready to pour out over all Europe, was preparing for the Pontiff the most cruel anxieties perhaps that a head of the Church universal had ever known.

Never was Pius VI misled about the perils which the license of morals and the impiety of men's minds made the Church and society undergo. His first encyclical (December 25, 1775) denounced "the corruption of morals, of speech, and of life" which characterized the society of the ancient regime at that time, and the daring of "those wretched philosophers who, repeating to the point of weariness that man is born free and that he ought not to submit to the rule of anyone, ended only by the loosening of the bonds that joined men together." [14] But that such doctrines would soon manifest themselves by a political and social revolution and that this revolution would first break out in that France where the pious King Louis XVI reigned, all this the Pontiff was far from suspecting at the time.

---

[13] A written and open approbation would have stirred the wrath of the Bourbon courts.

Other dark days would precede that great storm. When the first acclamation that greeted his coming quieted down, the Sovereign Pontiff soon perceived on the political horizon four dark spots, apparently localized and precise. The Kingdom of Naples' inclination to independence with regard to the Holy See, Emperor Joseph II's encroachments on the spiritual authority of the Church, the interference of the court of Russia in the affair of the Jesuits, and the penetration of Jansenist doctrines into the court of Tuscany: such were the objects of Pius VI's first concern.

An ancient feudal tribute, going back to Robert Guiscard, obliged the king of Naples to bring yearly to the Sovereign Pontiff a sum of 10,000 Roman ecus. This tribute had given rise to diplomatic differences between the court of Naples and the Holy See. From the beginning of the eighteenth century the question had been assuming graver proportions. With regard to this conflict, the Roman Curia had filled the chanceries with its complaints.[15] In 1759 Ferdinand IV ascended the throne of Naples. This pupil of Tanucci, who strangely mingled a sincere religious piety [16] with the principles of Rousseau's philosophy, did but embitter the quarrel when he became king. He obstinately refused to render the traditional homage of vassalage that was demanded of him. Neither the rebukes of the Supreme Pontiff nor the intervention of friendly powers nor the compensations proposed by Pius VI, who offered to the King of Naples even the right of nomination to bishoprics,[17] was able to move Ferdinand to perform a ceremony in which the Holy See saw the recognition of a lawful tribute, but which the Neapolitan court regarded as an outworn ceremony, irreconcilable with the spirit of modern times. Fundamentally the great question of the French Revolution was in this conflict. That fact was undoubtedly what gave the affair so much importance. This famous question of the tribute was terminated only by the French invasion, the deportation of Pius VI, and finally the expulsion of the King of Naples.

---

[14] Barberi, *Bullarium,* V, 180–85.

[15] Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 91.

[16] *Ibid.,* I, 92.

In Germany, too, Pius VI encountered a form of the revolutionary crisis. We are acquainted with the movement of ideas that occurred in the Germanic countries during the second half of the eighteenth century. The two chief forms of Gallicanism —Caesarism and episcopalism—had entered there and had even acentuated their offensive against the papacy, under the names of Josephism and Febronianism.

Pius VI's Visit to Vienna

In 1781, while the commission of regulars in France, under the auspices of the sole authority of the civil government and apart from any influence of the Holy See, was pursuing the pretended reform of the monastic life, Emperor Joseph II of Germany, on a vaster scale and with far greater activity, had already undertaken to regulate the entire discipline of the Church in his states. To require the imperial placet for the publication of all papal bulls, to suppress all monasteries that did not tend to the development of the national education such as he meant it, to forbid all religious houses to hold any relations with foreign superiors, to place in the hands of the state the entire public education, including that of the clergy, to suppress confraternities, to abolish processions, to regulate the number of Masses, Benedictions, and even the number of candles to be lit at certain church services: such had been the principal measures undertaken against the Church by him whom Frederick II of Prussia called "my brother the sacristan." With uneasy forebodings, Pius VI followed the steps taken against the Holy See by the son of Maria Theresa, and at first showed a paternal condescension toward the sovereign. Then, seeing that his protests obtained no good result, he took, in spite of the contrary advice of all the ambassadors accredited to him and of most of the members of the Sacred College, a supreme resolve: that of going to Vienna to talk to the Emperor, who he knew was endowed with great natural qualities, particularly with a sincere devotion to the welfare of the people.[18]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, II, 91.

The Emperor did not dare oppose the Pope's journey. But, at the Vienna court, those who inspired the Emperor's religious policy trembled. The minister, Kaunitz, proposed to Joseph II that a circular instruction should be issued, directing all the bishops to remain in their episcopal cities as long as the Pope was at Vienna.[19] He feared a contact of the head of the Church with the episcopate. Certain others even feared that the Pope, once he should arrive at the Austrian capital, might take advantage of some solemnity to interpellate the Emperor directly and thus exert a mighty influence on the masses. Joseph judged it more prudent in receiving the Holy Father to act "as a respectful son of the Church, as a courteous host," yet, as he added, determined not to let himself be taken advantage of by any tragic acts of the Pope and to remain unshakable in his principles.[20]

---

[18] This journey was not something unprecedented in the history of the papacy. From Innocent I (409) to Clement VIII (1598) thirty-seven pontiffs had taken up the traveler's staff from a sense of duty. See *Histoire des voyages des papes depuis Innocent Ier jusqu'à Pie VI* (1786).

[19] Schlitter, *Die Reise des Papstes,* p. 36.

On March 20, 1782, Pius VI made his entry into the Austrian capital. The Emperor and his brother came out to meet him at a distance of a few miles from the city. The people gave the Pontiff a most enthusiastic testimony of their respect and affection.

> Almost every day the two sovereigns had long conferences by themselves. They used to pass three or four hours together and, when they separated, they appeared satisfied with each other. Very likely they really were so, and evidently this satisfaction could be produced only by a common understanding. If the results corresponded so little to the hopes, we may well suppose that this failure was owing to Kaunitz and Cobenzl, and that a large part of the responsibility for the subsequent acts must weigh on those ministers, those two evil geniuses of the Emperor.[21]

Upon returning to Rome, Pius VI did indeed have the pain of learning that the Emperor was continuing to abolish the monasteries and to regulate public worship as before. Had the Pontiff's journey, then, been useless? Far from it. Josephism had experienced some fear; this was the most notable result of the step taken by Pius VI. Joseph II had felt in the papacy a power in public opinion which he must take account of. When, two years later, the Emperor, having arrogated to himself the free disposal of the Lombard bishoprics, judged that he must go to Rome and there confer with the head of the Church and conclude a sort of concordat with him, Pius VI could know that his journey to Vienna had constrained Josephism to inaugurate a policy of deference toward the Holy See.[22]

Six years later, when, prompted by the episcopalism of Febronius, the ecclesiastical electors of Germany, in a memorial presented to the Diet of Ratisbon, demanded a new law of the Empire, which would suppress on German soil the jurisdiction of the nuncios; when, the following year, four days after the taking of the Bastille, Archbishop Erthal of Mainz issued to his priests, as a defiance to the Holy See, a circular letter of convocation to the national synod, the danger seemed to arise again under another form. But "successive incidents caused the adjournment of the assembly; then the brutal reality, in the person of Custine and French soldiers, stifled the schism even before it started." [23]

---

[20] Letter of March 7, 1782, quoted in *Joseph II und Leopold von Toscana* (1872).

[21] Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 265.

[22] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse*, I, 52.

Difficulties with Russia

At the very height of the Josephist crisis, the Pope found himself involved in the greatest difficulties with Russia. We have already seen how, at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits by the different states of Europe, Empress Catherine II received them with favor. A ukase of Peter the Great had forbidden these religious admittance into the Empire. But Catherine, after the partition of Poland, was able to appreciate the education given by the fathers in their flourishing colleges of Mohileff and Polotsk. The governor of White Russia,[24] Tchernychef, pushed his sympathy for the Society of Jesus so far that, when Clement XIV's brief of suppression appeared, he forbade, under the severest penalties, the publication in Russia of any brief coming from Rome.[25] By making itself the protector of the Catholic cause, the government of St. Petersburg surpassed at a single stroke the utmost limits of the Gallicanism practiced at the courts of Versailles and of Vienna; or rather, Gallicanism, everywhere latent, took in each country the form adapted to the national customs. The Muscovite autocrat did not stop there. Catherine had noticed among the new subjects that the treaty of 1772 had given her a canon of Vilna by the name of Siestrzencewicz, a man of rare intelligence and vast erudition.[26] The Czarina obtained from the nuncio of Poland, Garampi, a decision that Siestrzencewicz should be consecrated titular bishop of Mallo.[27] An imperial decree (May 12, 1774) attributed to the newly chosen prelate an annual salary of 10,000 rubles and assigned Mohileff to him as his residence. Then, not satisfied with erecting on her own authority a new Catholic episcopal see, the schismatic sovereign gave to the incumbent of this bishopric a universal jurisdiction over the Latin Catholics of her Empire. This move was paralleled by the audacity to which, sixteen years later, the authors of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy would proceed.[28]

---

[23] *Ibid.*, I, 79.

[24] The term White Russia designates the country which Russia acquired by the partition of Poland. It comprised almost the entire diocese of Livonia and the part of the diocese of Vilna professing the Latin rite. On the attitude of the Jesuits at the time of the partition of Poland, see Zalenski, S. J., *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche* (French translation, I, 244).

[25] "The parish priest of Orcha and that of Vitebsk published the brief of suppression. Soon afterward a messenger came to them, with his carriage, and took away the poor priests to join the other exiles in Siberia." Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 340.

Some declare that, before his consecration, the Bishop of Mallo had signed and placed in the hands of the Empress an explicit promise to maintain the Jesuits in the fullness of their status.[29] Whatever may be the truth of this statement, Russia soon became a refuge for the members of the Society of Jesus, expelled from Poland, Germany, and Italy. The Bishop of Mallo arrogated to himself the right to ordain them even to the priesthood. The Bourbon courts protested vigorously.[30] The Pope seemed to be in an impasse. From the religious point of view his conscience refused to abrogate the decree of Clement

---

[26] On this strange personage, skeptical, worldly, and clever, a Russian type of the eighteenth-century episcopate, see Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 257–64.

[27] Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 329.

[28] Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 261.

[29] Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 338; Gagarin, *La Compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie*, p. 29; Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 268.

[30] Cf. Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 344.

XIV and to pursue the Jesuits in their last asylum. From the political point of view he was obliged to conciliate both the Catholic kings of the house of Bourbon and the haughty Czarina, who threatened expressly to withdraw from her subjects the liberty of professing the Catholic religion if her desires were not heeded.[31] Pius VI protested, by a letter addressed (January 27, 183) to the King of France and the King of Spain, that he confirmed the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* of his predecessor, but he approved orally, in an audience given in March of the same year, granted to the coadjutor of Mohileff, the *status quo* of the Society of Jesus in Russia. Henceforth the Society had a vicar general in the person of the vice-provincial, Father Stanislaus Czerniewicz, who was succeeded two years later by Father Lenkeiwicz. At the same time the Bishop of Mallo, now promoted to the archbishopric of Mohileff, received the title and powers of apostolic visitator of all the houses of regulars established in Russia.[32]

Grand Duke of Tuscany

While the Russian court was so keenly taking up the quarrel for the Jesuits, the court of Tuscany moved to defend Jansenism. We know what spirit prevailed at Florence under the rule of Grand Duke Leopold, brother of Emperor Joseph II, and under the influence of Bishop Scipio Ricci. We are acquainted with the principal decisions of the strange gathering assembled at Pistoia (September 15, 1782) under the name of a council. Its undisguised aim was to introduce the maxims and the spirit of Port Royal, first in all the religious houses, then in all the churches of Tuscany. But when (April, 1787) the Grand Duke, in conformity with Ricci's desires, convoked at Florence an assembly of the seventeen bishops of his duchy for the purpose of carrying out the decree of the so-called council, fourteen of them firmly refused. They were, moreover, the interpreters of public opinion, outraged by the Jansenist innovations, which were intended to replace the traditional worship.

---

[31] See the letter quoted by Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

[32] Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 322–25.

Ricci and his followers day by day made themselves more disliked. On May 20, a popular uprising directed against them suddenly broke out and, as usually happens in such circumstances, became unbounded. The day was a Sunday, toward evening. The faithful were coming for a festivity which the Confraternity of a Happy Death was celebrating at the cathedral of Prato. All of a sudden the report spread that Ricci and his followers decided to destroy the altar which had a particularly venerated Madonna. The church bells were rung. At this summons the people of the city and neighborhood came running, armed with clubs and picks. Crying out, "Long live the Holy See," they seized the bishop's throne,[33] smashed it, and burned it. They spent the whole night collecting, at the seminary or in various other places, crucifixes, Madonnas, and other images which Ricci had removed from the churches. These they carried in procession through the city and forced Ricci's followers to acclaim them. The tumult continued for several days. The Bishop's residence was broken into; his manuscripts and his Jansenist books were burnt in the public square.

For the time being the only effect of these deeds of violence was to exasperate the irritable spirit of Bishop Ricci. As counselor of Leopold, he instigated the latter to adopt the most odious measures against the popular devotions, particularly against the devotion to the Sacred Heart; the congregation established under this title was suppressed. But these excesses by a prelate whose unbalanced character had offended many persons, finally turned even the Grand Duke's advisers against him. When in 1790, on the death of Joseph II, Leopold left Tuscany to assume the imperial crown, the hatreds that the Bishop of Pistoia had stirred up against himself broke loose. Driven out of Pistoia by the people, Ricci withdrew to Florence, and there he resigned his see.

---

[33] The see of Prato was joined to that of Pistoia, where Ricci was bishop.

These events put the Sovereign Pontiff in a delicate position. He could not seem to approve doctrines manifestly unorthodox, nor could he sanction a popular movement that had been stained by disorder and hatred. Pius VI also judged that the interests of the Church would not be served by risking, against the Emperor, a strife that might have disastrous consequences. He temporized. He ordered a close study of the seven volumes containing the acts of the Synod of Pistoia. Scarcely had Emperor Leopold been laid at rest, when the bull *Auctorem fidei* officially proclaimed the Catholic doctrine, by solemnly condemning the decrees of the so-called council.

The "acts of emancipation" of the court of Naples, like the abusive interference of the court of Russia, the ideas that the minister Kaunitz suggested to Joseph II, like the policy which Bishop Ricci inspired in Leopold, were merely intermittent and scattered manifestations of a state of mind that was agitating all Europe. France was about to give the final maxims of this state of mind.

PART II

THE REVOLUTION

THE Revolution, though a European event, was in some ways universal; but the heart of it was in France. There we can more easily mark the various stages that it passed through. From the religious viewpoint these stages were three in number: the Constituent Assembly stripped the Church of her goods and her rights; the Legislative Assembly and the Convention persecuted her in the person of her ministers and her faithful; the Directory tried to supplant her in her worship. From this religious point of view, which is the one we intend to take, the picture we shall have to paint of the revolutionary work may appear to some readers as depicted in too somber colors.

But we adopt as our own the declarations which the eminent author of the *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution* puts at the head of his work. We, too, wish that the reader should see in our severity "neither lack of justice nor any trace of passion." In our turn, "if we were to judge in its totality the work of the Constituent Assembly, we would not fail to place in relief, among all the reforms accomplished by it, those measures that marked memorable progress in the field of administration, and especially in civil, financial, and criminal legislation."[1] We shall also have occasion to note that the Catholic Church was never the foe of these progressive measures. Her faithful and her ministers were often the first to second them; more than once they took the initiative in these matters. Only by falsification of history can anyone maintain that the honor belongs only to her enemies.

---

[1] De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* I, iv.

CHAPTER IV

The Church Despoiled (1789–90)

ON MAY 4, 1789, the city of Versailles presented an unusual sight. King Louis XVI, accompanied by representatives of all the classes of the nation, took part in a procession of the Blessed Sacrament, which was followed by a Solemn Mass in the church of St. Louis.[1] Archbishop de Juigné of Paris pontificated, and Bishop de La Fare of Nancy delivered a discourse which had for its subject the influence of religion on the happiness of nations. Some passages of the sermon, when the preacher directed his attack against the abuses of the political and religious institutions and called for liberty as the chief remedy, were received by prolonged applause, which some persons judged little suited to the sacredness of the place. The next day the King, with great solemnity, opened the States General. In the hall of the Menus-Plaisirs the King took his seat, surrounded by the princes of the blood royal. The court was ranged on the steps of the throne. The three orders occupied the rest of the hall: on the right the 291 deputies of the clergy; on the left the 270 representatives of the nobility, glittering with gold and embroidery; at the rear, on the lower seats and in simple black dress, bareheaded, the 584 members of the third order.

---

[1] This procession was not merely a liturgical ceremony, isolated and unconnected with the feelings of the people. The whole nation set itself to pray, asking God to bestow His blessings on the States General. We have before our eyes one of the printed sheets which at that time circulated among the priests and the faithful. It says: "Let us do a holy violence upon the Lord to obtain from His mercy that He will direct the counsels and measures of the assembled nation and that He will spread in all hearts a pure, efficacious, and generous love for the public welfare. And let us beg favors and success for ourselves and for our country only as a means of attaining that blessed and eternal society where we shall all be kings and where one single good will suffice for all and for all time by its immense fullness." The sheet ends by the repetition of several different prayers, the first three of them being taken from the Paris Missal, "For the holding of the States General."

In this city of Versailles, which the absolute power of Louis XIV had created, all the classes of society and all the provinces were represented. All the demands, all the wishes of the people of France which, for almost two centuries, had not had royal audience were at length able to find expression.[2]

The Condition of France in 1789

A subdued and restless discontent stirred the masses. The harshness of the winter of 1788, marked by famine, had exasperated men's minds. The 1,200 deputies[3] assembled about the King could render a report of those conditions. The representatives of Normandy were prepared to tell of the scenes of pillage and death that smeared their province with blood.[4] The Bretons could relate how some people of Nantes had almost cut to pieces a man who was thought to be a receiver of stolen goods. The deputies from Provence could likewise draw a picture of the violence committed by an incensed populace at Marseilles, Aix, Toulon, Brignoles, Riez, and Manosque.[5] Touraine, Poitou, the Orléans district, Burgundy, Auvergne, and Languedoc had witnessed similar scenes.[6] Everywhere, among these people that famine exasperated, that the social inequalities enraged, certain vague hopes appeared. In the newspapers and in pamphlets that the public read avidly, the sole question was that of a new era of liberty, of equality, of moral and material well-being, which they felt was now at hand.

---

[2] The last meeting of the States General had been held in 1614. An assembly of the notables had been convoked by Richelieu in 1626. The assembly of the notables, called by Louis XVI in 1787, adjourned to give way to the States General.

[3] The exact figure is 1,158.

[4] Floquet, *Histoire du parlement de Normandie,* VII, 508.

[5] Taine, *Les origines,* III, 27–33.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 15. "In the four months before the taking of the Bastille, France witnessed more than three hundred uprisings." Taine, *loc. cit.*

What the Bishop of Nancy had just openly proclaimed in the Versailles church, in the presence of the King and the deputies, many a village curé had already said to his people. For several years parish and provincial assemblies had been held. At those meetings, where plebeians sat beside lords, the raising of taxes was discussed and decided. On Sunday upon coming out of church, or on market days, at the village inn, the peasants were made acquainted with the situation. The royal letter of July 5, 1788, permitting to all competent persons and bodies the sending of memorials on the state of the country, and the regulation (January 24, 1789) requiring that, "from the remotest places of the kingdom and from the most inconspicuous habitations, each should be assured of sending its wishes and its demands to His Majesty,"[7] had encouraged the popular movement. Serious ecclesiastics constructed gigantic systems for the reorganization of the possessions of the clergy.[8] The *Journal ecclésiastique,* issued since 1760 under the direction of Father Barruel, a former Jesuit, was the organ of the most orthodox Catholicity. In its columns, beginning in April, 1789, was a special section in which the abuses of the times were pointed out.[9]

The Assembly

After such a movement of popular opinion, we should not be surprised that the first session of the States General was marked by an unusual agitation. Moreover, in the outward circumstances everything seemed calculated to provoke this agitation. The assembly included many upright and educated men, some eminent persons. But the fact of the immense number of the members was not favorable to serious discussions. The large size of the hall—a detail brought out by Taine's psychology—by obliging the speakers to raise their voices, favored pompous and abstract oratory. Besides, from the very first session, an impression was given that the division of the three orders no longer corresponded to the actual situation; but their suppression apparently could not be made without disturbance and clamor.

---

[7] Duvergier, *Collection des lois et décrets,* I, 1–23.

[8] In Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* I, 61–63, the reader will find the curious project of Father Thuin. The general principle of the project was the cession to the state of the entirety of the ecclesiastical goods. With the liquidation of these possessions an annual net revenue of 456,000,000 francs should remain available. Four-fifths of this revenue should furnish the support of the clergy; the rest would be divided between the poor and the church boards, these latter being responsible for the upkeep of the religious buildings. The nation would receive from the division a revenue of 76,000,000 francs.

[9] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 64–67.

At any rate, might a man be found in the assembly, capable of taking the lead in the movement so as to direct it or at need to restrain it if not to halt it?

The natural head of this assembly, King Louis XVI, was evidently not of a stature to fill such a part. Kind, affable, and sincerely attached to the Catholic Church, whose precepts he observed most exactly in his private life, he had been received, at his entrance, with bursts of enthusiasm, but at the same time with cries of complaint against the disgraces of the preceding reign. But in the fifteen years during which he held the reins of government, he had too often shown a gentleness that tended to weakness, to indecision, to blundering evasions. The various influences active about him were successively cast off, one after the other. Maurepas, Turgot, Malesherbes, Necker, to whom he appealed to relieve the disastrous state of the finances, had fallen. The Queen then decided to intervene in the handling of the affairs and in the choice of the ministers, but she raised up against them and against herself such unpopularity[10] that the King had to turn again to Necker. The summoning of an assembly of the notables, then of the States General, seemed to be the supreme remedy for the situation. But now the question arose whether the path on which they were entering was not full of formidable complications.

---

[10] The unfortunate affair of the necklace is too well known to require relating here. It greatly injured the Queen's popularity. She was also accused of having understandings with the powerful enemies of France. But Marie Antoinette was a

The Upper Clergy

Often, in great critical epochs, the king of France had found in some member of the upper clergy a prudent and loyal adviser. Four prelates stood out among the members who sat at the King's right: they were Archbishop de Juigné of Paris, Bishop de La Fare of Nancy, Archbishop Le Franc de Pompignan of Vienne, and Archbishop de Boisgelin of Aix.

De Juigné, son of Marquis de Juigné who was killed in the Battle of Guastalia, was charity personified. The 600,000 francs that the archbishopric of Paris brought to him was used entirely in alms: each day hundreds of the poor received at the Archbishop's door food which he put at their disposal with inexhaustible generosity. No one ever knew the number of persons that he pensioned from his personal resources. He had a cultured mind; his ideas were orthodox beyond reproach. The flatteries heaped on him by the Jansenists at the outset of his episcopate were powerless to win him to their cause. Unfortunately with Archbishop de Juigné the qualities of mind and will were not at the level of his charity and piety. To discern the future, to sense the strong side and the weak side of men and of things, to fix a rule of conduct, and to adhere to it with energy, such was never the good fortune of this virtuous prelate. Although an excellent shepherd so long as he had merely to walk along paths already marked out, he was unequal to his

---

complete stranger to the intrigues of the affair of the necklace. The entire responsibility in the case falls on Madame de La Mote and Cardinal de Rohan. As to her so-called steps toward bringing foreign interventions into France, we shall see later what is to be thought of this accusation.

task when he should have to give proof of far-sightedness and firmness.[11]

Neither the clear view of the reforms to be accomplished nor the courage required to pursue them was lacking in Bishop de La Fare of Nancy and Archbishop de Pompignan of Vienne. The former, after boldly speaking of abuses to be fought and of liberty to be established, in his opening address in the church of St. Louis, would have to defend vigorously on the rostrum of the Assembly the independence of the goods of the Church and the life of the monastic institutions. De Pompignan, who in his writings had disclosed the poison of Rousseau's doctrine better than anyone else, would soon have to lend the King his devoted collaboration to safeguard whatever could still be rescued of the traditional institutions of France. But neither of these men was a politician in the lofty sense of the word.[12]

The title of great politician seems rather to belong to Archbishop Boisgelin of Aix. Before appearing in the States General this noble prelate was known simply as a strong and hardy thinker by his commentary on Montesquieu. In times of disturbance he had been seen holding under his strong and supple hand the agitated population of Provence.[13] Again and again we shall see him manifesting the clear-sightedness and the spirit of decision that belong to a statesman. If the Assembly that was opening were capable of listening to a doctrine of moderation, of justice, and of prudent progress, De Boisgelin would have furnished it with convincing formulas. But the men of that time, according to the remark of Joseph de Maistre, seemed to be led by a power stronger than themselves.[14] The passion agitating them would heed only the language of passion, and the worthy prelates who sat in their midst could not offer them this language.

---

[11] On Archbishop de Juigné, see Lambert, *Vie de Mgr de Juigné* (1821); Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* I, 91 and *passim;* Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* I, 77–112.

[12] See Claude Bouvier, *Le Franc de Pompignan,* pp. 89–98.

[13] Cardinal de Bausset, who had been Archbishop de Boisgelin's vicar general, relates how that Provençal prelate in the winter of 1789, by the influence of his virtue, the persuasive power of his words, and the wisdom of his procedure, was able to calm an almost general uprising of the city of Aix. See Picot, *Mémoires,* V, 354. In the *Œuvres oratoires de M. de Boisgelin,* p. 196, see the order issued on that occasion, March 27, 1789.

In this tumultuous gathering of men sent to Paris to express the wishes of France, we may distinguish two rather compact and distinct groups in spite of all the artificial divisions: the group of jurists, 374 in number, and the lower clergy, counting no less than 208 representatives.

The Lawyers

In an assembly meeting with the vague intention of recasting the constitution of France, the group of lawyers would enjoy a decisive role. Unfortunately these men brought with them all the prejudices of parliamentary Gallicanism and of the Jansenist sect. Camus and Treilhard, whom we shall see taking part with all the prestige of their technical erudition and of their tricks of procedure, will not for a moment lose sight of the two aims of the old Gallicanism and the most radical Jansenism: to oppose the so-called encroachments of Rome and, by the intervention of the civil power, to lead the Church back to a so-called spirit of the first centuries.[15]

The Lower Clergy

By their closer contact with the people the priests of the lower clergy had, more than the others, an appreciation of the miseries of the regime. Out of pity for their brethren much more than by a one-sided desire for innovation, they aspired to an era of social reorganization. But their tendencies, precisely because they proceeded from sentiment rather than from reason, ran the risk of being chimerical. Too many, while energetically rejecting the antireligious theories of the reformers, readily gave ear to their political and social ideas. One of them, Sieyès, in the interval between the dissolution of the assembly of the notables and the meeting of the States General, had published three ringing pamphlets. Their subjects were respectively: View on the means of execution, Essay on privileges, What is the Third Estate? Their contents may be summed up in two phrases: "What is the Third Estate? Nothing." "What ought it to be? Everything."

---

[14] De Maistre, *Considérations sur la France,* chaps. 1 and 5.

[15] On the clearly Gallican principles of Camus and Treilhard, see Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 3-7.

Abbé Sieyès

Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, born at Fréjus on May 3, 1748, would become one of the most noteworthy figures of the Revolution and perhaps the most singular.[16] At any rate, he would become the most representative man of the Constituent Assembly, to which he would, most of the time, furnish the inspiring idea or the final formula of its declarations. With a doubtful religious vocation, he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice at the age of seventeen. There he expressed such hardy ideas that his teachers invited him with friendly consideration to withdraw to another establishment.[17] After receiving his licentiate at the Sorbonne, he was ordained priest a few years later at the seminary of Saint-Firmin. Soon afterward, from his reflections on the writings of Condillac, Bonnet, Helvetius,

---

[16] Sainte-Beuve, *Galerie de portraits historiques,* p. 537.

[17] In the register of the seminary of St. Sulpice we read the following: "Josephus-Emmanuel Sieyès, entered November 13, 1765, left December 4, 1770; sly, of a spirit suspect. He was advised to leave. He went to the seminary of Saint-Firmin." Some of Sieyès' manuscripts of this period are venturesome outlines. As Sainte-Beuve says, we can easily understand that they aroused his superiors' suspicions. Sainte-Beuve, *loc. cit.*

Rousseau, and some economists, Abbé Sieyès composed a personal doctrine of "social art," as he called it. This "social art," which he declared he had discovered, consisted essentially in the abolition of the privileges of the aristocracy and in the organization of democracy in certain extremely complicated arrangements. Its basis was the division of labor applied to various functions of the state, and an ingenious system of representation of persons and interests.

Venturous minds and some naive souls took up these innovations with passionate enthusiasm. One day Madame de Staël, in her salon, declared that the Abbé's writings and opinions would form a new era in the art of government as those of Newton did in physics.[18] And Sainte-Beuve said that in Sieyès was something of Descartes, that is, of the man who gladly made a *tabula rasa* of everything that had gone before, a man who began over again a new organization in every matter, social, economic, and political.[19]

Sieyès' ideas so well corresponded to the general tendencies of the Assembly that they exerted a preponderant influence there. The attitude of the clergy from the outset was largely dependent on this influence.

The representatives of the three orders, as all the classes of French society, were dominated more or less by the spirit of those who called themselves "the philosophers." Two men summed up that so-called philosophical spirit. They were Voltaire and Rousseau: Voltaire the demolisher of the old world, and Rousseau the self-designated builder of a new world. The teaching of both of them had received a hearty welcome in the salons of the upper society and had been effectively propagated there. Freemasonry counted among its members or friends a number of persons belonging to the high nobility and the clergy.

---

[18] Testimony of Gouverneur Morris, quoted by Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, p. 542.

[19] *Ibid.*

Mirabeau

But neither the Jansenism of Camus and Treilhard nor the utopias of Sieyès nor the doctrine of the "philosophers" nor the influence of Freemasonry would have acquired a prompt and effective influence unless they had found a powerful mouthpiece to express and impose them. We meet this organ of expression in a man who would be the most fiery of the orators and the most crafty of the politicians: Mirabeau. A man of aristocratic stock, whose family reckoned more than four hundred years of established nobility and who had just now passed over to the Third Estate out of contempt for aristocracy, Mirabeau, even when he sold himself to the monarchy, even when he proposed to the clergy that he would become the defender of their rights, would always remain the type of revolutionary, who upsets the established order and suggests a new order.

In him everything was a power because in him everything was a seductive influence that exerted a sort of violence on men's impatient spirit. He himself said, "No one knows all the might of my ugliness." This man, in disrepute because of his immorality, might well speak thus of his moral ugliness no less than of his physical ugliness. When, proudly thrown back on his bull-like neck, his enormous head appeared on the rostrum, with its olive tint, his cheeks scarred from smallpox, his flaming eyes, which passion at times animated to the point of their being bloodshot, and his mouth with its irregularly lined lips, from which a thunderous voice issued forth, whatever revolt was in men's souls recognized itself at once. The speaker's words were repeated throughout France. The dreams and passions that were fermenting in the souls of the people and finding expression in his fiery words increased the people's uneasiness. Anarchy was near the point of breaking forth.

The Antireligious Work of the Constituent Assembly

At the very first sessions of the Assembly that anarchy burst out, and events occurred pell-mell. By the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which because of the anarchy was practically interpreted as a forgetfulness of the rights of God; by the law "placing at the disposal" of the state the goods of the Church, which thus ended in the out-and-out spoliation of the clergy; by the suppression of the vows of religion, which amounted to suppression of the religious life; and by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which was the utter control of the clergy by the state: by all these measures the Revolution soon accomplished the first stages of the war undertaken against the Catholic Church.

Two expressions of Mirabeau and of Sieyès let loose the revolutionary movement. On June 17 the deputies of the Third Estate, on Sieyès' motion, declared that, as they represented 86 per cent of the nation, they constituted themselves the "National Assembly." Six days later the King annulled the decisions of the 17th and ordered the three estates to break up instantly. Thereupon Mirabeau exclaimed: "Nothing but force can make us depart. As for myself, I shall be put forth only if I am pierced with bayonets." [20] And Sieyès, addressing his fellow deputies, said: "You are today what you were yesterday; continue your deliberations." A short time afterward the majority of the clergy and forty-seven members of the nobility, with the Duke of Orléans at their head, joined the deputies of the Third Estate. The better to indicate its aim, the Assembly took the name of Constituent Assembly. The Revolution had begun in principle.

---

[20] These were Mirabeau's actual words. They have often been wrongly quoted as: "Go tell your master that we are here by the will of the people and that we will leave only by the force of bayonets."

Beginning of the Anarchy

Such events could not take place without a deep echo in the popular mind. We are not called upon to relate the excitement that followed: the concentration of troops at Versailles and Paris; the dismissal of the minister, Necker; the disturbance at the Palais Royal when Camille Desmoulins, with a pistol in his hand, shouted to the crowd: "The dismissal of Necker is the signal for a St. Bartholomew slaughter of patriots: To arms!"; the people wearing a new cockade as a rallying sign; Paris suddenly filled with an armed mob; the shops closing everywhere; the church bells ringing the alarm almost ceaselessly. Paris was exhibiting "a spontaneous anarchy," according to Taine's expression.[21]

Two incidents marked the character of the movement: the pillage of St. Lazare (July 13, 1789) and the taking of the Bastille (July 14).

The Pillage of St. Lazare

For the pillage of St. Lazare we have a detailed account in a memorial drawn up by two eyewitnesses. The report bears the marks of a most exact truthfulness.[22]

The house of St. Lazare was then inhabited by almost 400 persons: 200 priests, more than 100 novices or students, 80 brothers and boarders. . . . In the night of July 12, without any forewarning, 200 men variously armed rushed in tumult to the gates. They seemed to be undecided what to do. Then, at half-past two in the morning, at the command of some leaders, the doors were battered down. The brigands poured into the house. . . . They began eating and drinking in the refectory and demanded money. At first the hope was that they could be made to leave without difficulty. But, as all the entrances were open, a countless throng filled the house. About ten o'clock in the morning a horrible devastation began. They smashed the furniture, decorations, windows, beds; they pillaged all the rooms. The big library, containing almost 50,000 volumes, those of the professors, students, and boarders, were thrown out of the windows, scattered over the courtyard, reduced to a hopeless state of ruin. . . . They ravaged the room of St. Vincent de Paul, where various objects used by him were preserved. They smashed his statue, recently placed in a vestibule.

---

[21] Taine, *Les origines de la France contemporaine,* Vol. III, Bk. I, p. 3. Taine's expression, "spontaneous anarchy," has had a remarkable success. But this term is not altogether exact. The real anarchy did not begin until the taking of the Bastille and the night of August 4. Even then the anarchy was encouraged, sometimes provoked.

[22] The authors of this account were Father Dubois and Father Philippe, priests of St. Lazare. Father Dubois became pastor of St. Margaret's church and died in 1824. The narrative which we here quote is taken from the account first appearing in the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion à la fin du XVIII^e siècle,* published by Abbé Jaufpret.

They killed some sheep that were feeding in the enclosure. They set fire to the barns, and the firemen had difficulty in preventing the spread of the conflagration. . . . Even the priests of the house were in danger. Several of them were beaten, but none were killed. A number of them climbed over the walls of the enclosure; some sick persons were taken to the house of the Recollects near by and to the Hôtel-Dieu. . . .

Word had spread that the Lazarists had large stores of wheat, that they were hoarders. But the provision that was found would hardly have been enough to supply the house for three months. That whole section knew that, during the preceding six months, the Lazarists had distributed bread and soup to several hundred poor people. But the mob wished to give the charge the semblance of truth in the eyes of the people. They seized a priest and a subdeacon of the house. These two men, wearing their cassocks, were put in a cart, seated on sacks of wheat, and were thus taken to the market place, escorted by men who carried torches and arms. These men would finallly have immolated the two victims but for the cleverness and energy of an officer of the guard.

Amid this disaster certain circumstances were noteworthy. No profanation occurred in the church, the only spot in the whole establishment that was spared. Moreover, in the wrecked bedrooms the crucifixes were respected. Another striking incident concerned a venerable old man, almost eighty years of age, who was a paralytic. At the infirmarian's request, they themselves carried him to the house of the Daughters of Charity, whose spiritual director he had been. When they reached there, they said: "We are bringing your father to you." A few hours later, that is, about five o'clock, a larger number appeared at the house of the Daughters of Charity in the hope of finding there that store of wheat which they had vainly searched for at St. Lazare. Some of these men decided to enter the chapel, where the novices were gathered together. The evident fright of these young women and the holiness of the place impressed the men. They withdrew with signs of respect. A few of them even knelt down. In the course of these various visits not a single indecent word was heard.

This account, with all the marks of sincerity, shows us the nature of those first popular uprisings. Camille Desmoulins, a theorist, a journalist, a young lawyer without any practice, a man not yet thirty years old, nourished on the theories of the *Social Contract,* was the one who set everything going. A starving populace turned to pillage. Yet, at the very moment of their greatest excitement, the people still retained an instinctive respect for religion, for modesty, and for all holy things. This condition would not last; and the people of Paris, as well as those throughout the rest of France, would unfortunately become accustomed little by little to every sort of sacrilege and horror.

The Taking of the Bastille

Mere hatred for the "hoarders" had stirred up the mob in the pillage of St. Lazare. The taking of the Bastille, which occurred the next day, was owing to a movement of political excitement.

The Bastille was an old state prison where persons were confined by simple *lettre de cachet* of the king.[23] In the public mind the Bastille was the most conspicuous personification of despotism. True, in it had been imprisoned far more great lords than common people. Historical evidence has shown that the prisoners generally led a rather comfortable life.[24] But legends and pamphlets had made of it a place of mystery and dread, and the people clung to this notion of it.

---

[23] A *lettre de cachet* was a judiciary act, issued by the royal power, without any opportunity of defense by the accused and without any legal procedure whatever.

The events of July 14 are so well known that we need not recount them here: the attack led by the militia, hastily armed with rifles and cannons taken from the Invalides; De Launey (the governor of the prison), Flesselles (the provost of provisions), and several subordinate officials massacred, their heads, streaked with blood, stuck on the ends of pikes above a howling mob; and the freed prisoners paraded in triumph. These prisoners were seven in number: four forgers, two lunatics, and a sadist. Louis XVI, upon hearing a report of the event, is said to have remarked, "Is this a revolt?" To which the Duke of Liancourt answered, "No, Sire. It is a revolution." The mob, which the day before had halted in the presence of the image of Christ, would not recoil before the symbol of what it called tyranny.

The event produced a deep impression throughout Europe. The sovereigns saw in it a presage of approaching upsets in their states.[25]

We should note that neither the people nor even the clergy seemed to regard this event as an attack on religion. The next day a deputation of the Assembly, taken from the three estates and including Count de Lally, Tollendal, Archbishop de Juigné of Paris, and Bailly, the deputy of the capital, went to the Hôtel de Ville. Bailly was acclaimed mayor of Paris in place of the provost Flesselles; Lafayette was given the command of the National Guard. Then the Archbishop invited the people to come to the cathedral for the singing of a Te Deum "in thanksgiving for the re-establishment of peace." [26] Between the brutal passions of the mob, the philosophical chimeras of Rousseau's disciples, and the principles of the gospel, a confusion existed at least in a large number of minds. This confusion would disappear only little by little. Its persistence enables us to understand many of the events among those we are about to relate.

---

[24] Funck-Brentano, *Légendes et archives de la Bastille* (1904). By the same author, *Des lettres de cachet à Paris* (1903). Cf. Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. III, Part I, pp. 314–17.

[25] Michelet relates the following anecdote about Kant. For sixty years Kant used to set forth each day at precisely the same hour. For a definite number of minutes, without speaking to anyone, he followed exactly the same route, as we see on certain old city clocks an iron man come forth, strike the hour, and then return. But one day a strange irregularity was noted by the inhabitants of Königsberg. The familiar planet was not following his set course. Emmanuel Kant was walking toward the highway by which the courier from France used to come. The previous day Kant had learned of the taking of the Bastille. He had a presentiment that a great event had taken place.

The votes taken during the night of August 4 and the Declaration of the Rights of Man, published August 23, reveal the continuance of the same state of mind.

The Provinces

The example given by the capital was followed in the provinces. The mobs had pillaged Paris: they had destroyed the symbol of tyranny; in a spontaneous movement they had elected a municipal government. Under the inspiration of seditious papers, circulated profusely in the cities and country districts, and at the instigation of revolutionary agitators who journeyed through France sowing false terrors, bands of brigands rose up everywhere. The alarm was spread wherever a center of "hoarding" was pointed out, wherever a feudal or monastic "bastille" rose up. Seize the grain being held to provoke a famine; destroy the last asylums where social inequalities were being perpetuated: such were the watchwords.

At once those who might naturally be expected to take up the defense of the ancient regime began to emigrate. The Count of Artois with his two sons, Prince de Condé, Prince de Conti, Maréchal de Broglie, Maréchal de Castries, the Duke de Polignac, Prince de Lambesc, Baron de Breteuil, and many other members of the nobility fled to foreign lands. Their abandoned estates were seized by armed bands that pillaged them; bonfires were lighted, the flames fed by old charters; many a château was a prey to the flames: [27] such was the end of a regime that had become hateful. To complete the ruin of the nobility, cities and towns accomplished their municipal revolution, as was done at Paris: they elected permanent committees, armed the National Guard, dismissed the agents of the central power, and tried to govern themselves.

---

[26] Picot, *Mémoires,* V, 368.

The Night of August 4

The reports of these disturbances reached the capital and troubled men's minds. The most effective means of calming the popular excitement seemed to be to sacrifice whatever angered the populace. What the people were going to take by force had better be offered to them with good grace. Such was the origin of the decisive action taken on the night of August 4.

A representative of the nobility, Viscount de Noailles, proposed the immediate abolition of all feudal taxes; the clergy, in a burst of enthusiastic generosity, at once joined in the proposal. They were used to great sacrifices; at every crisis they had offered their *dons gratuits* bountifully to the monarchy.[28] This time the gift was as reckless as it was generous. By the lips of Archbishop de Juigné the clergy gave up their land taxes. Then, one after the other, Bishop de La Fare of Nancy,

---

[27] In January, 1790, Necker estimated at 60,000,000 francs the amount of the indemnities due the victims of these outrages. Prudhomme, *Révolutions de Paris,* no. 47.

[28] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* V, 17 ff.

Bishop de Lubersac of Chartres, and Archbishop de Boisgelin of Aix arose: the first condemning the feudal taxes of the "ecclesiastical lords"; the second speaking against "the right of the chase"; the third denouncing the arbitrary extension of the so-called rights of domain, the salt tax, and other taxes. The Assembly voted the redemption of the tithes, the prohibition of plurality of benefices, and the abolition of the right of *deport,* that is, the right which, in several dioceses, was held by the bishops or the archdeacons to enjoy the revenues of vacant parishes.

The curés, having no feudal rights to sacrifice, offered at least their perquisites. With impulsive ardor they associated the pope himself in this sacrifice by suppressing the annates. Toward the close of the session, Abbé Grégoire mounted the rostrum and said: "I propose the abolition of the annates, that monument of simony against which the Council of Basel has already decreed." Men's minds were too heated for a cool discussion of this question which, however, deserved the trouble. The authority of the Council of Basel could not be canonically appealed to. Moreover, the French clergy could not juridically dispose of the rights of the Sovereign Pontiff without even consulting him. Furthermore, the question of the annates had been regulated by an explicit provision of the concordat of 1516.[29] But the abolition of this right was decided without any discussion. The entire collection of articles was passed amid general enthusiasm. The deputies of the Third Estate, to have their part in this movement of generosity, gave up the privileges belonging to certain provinces and cities. The clergy, through the Archbishop of Paris, offered to chant a solemn Te Deum of thanksgiving at Notre Dame, and the nobility, through Marquis de Lally-Tollendal, proposed to decree for Louis XVI the title of "Restorer of French Liberty."

---

[29] It is true that this tax was paid very irregularly and only by a few of the benefice-holders. Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* V, 258.

On the following days the Assembly, far from manifesting any regret over its decision, did but accentuate the provisions.

The Tithes

Article 5 of the decree passed on the night of August 4 ordered the redemption of the tithes due to the clergy. But, in the deplorable situation to which the finances of the state were reduced, how could the state meet the obligations created by the redemption? On August 8, in connection with a loan requested by the minister (Necker), Marquis de La Coste, deputy from Charolais, proposed to hypothecate this loan on the possessions of the clergy. The measure was premature and, for the time being, was rejected. But the next day Mirabeau asked the Assembly to vote the suppression of the tithe pure and simple.

After all, was the tithe anything more than a form of salary always subject to revocation, "with which the nation paid the officers of morality and education"? When these words provoked some murmuring, the orator with the full thunder of his voice replied: "I know of only three ways of existing in society: a man must be a beggar or a thief, or he must be salaried." The whole principle of communism was in these words. A notable part of the Assembly was drawn by Mirabeau's discourse. But Abbé Sieyès had the courage, in this circumstance, to utter words of good sense. He drew attention to the fact that the property burdened with the tithe had been purchased by the present owners only with a reckoning of the charges that were incumbent on it. To suppress these charges would simply raise the value of such property. He wisely remarked: "I do not think we need to make a present of 70,000,000 francs in taxes to the owners of this property. Those who profit by the outright abolition will not be the poor; they will be the rich." In a more pathetic tone a humble curé declared: "Gentlemen of the Third Estate, when you asked us to come to you in the name of a God of peace, did you do so to strangle us or make us die of hunger?" In fact, the suppression of the tithes diminished by half the revenue of the clergy.[30]

Hostility toward the Holy See

But the Assembly was beginning to feel the influence of the mobs, exasperated by wretchedness, fascinated by social utopias, and exploited by the leaders who were eager for popularity. On August 10, disorderly bands from Paris arrived at Versailles, asking with loud outcries for bread and demanding it from the property of the priests. The next day, to disarm any prejudice that might be felt toward them, the clergy decided not to prolong a discussion in which they blushed to defend their pecuniary interests. Several curés called for the reading of a bill in which they declared that they gave up their rights to the tithe. The Archbishop of Paris mounted the rostrum and made the following declaration: "My colleagues have merely gone beyond the sacrifice we are all offering to our country. We, all of us, place in the hands of the nation all the ecclesiastical tithes, and we entrust ourselves entirely to our country's wisdom. Let the gospel be proclaimed, let divine worship be celebrated with decency and dignity, let the churches be provided with virtuous and zealous pastors, let the poor be succored: this is the purpose of our ministry."[31]

That same day a memorial sent to the Assembly from the Roman court asked the French lawmakers to revoke the decision about the annates. This communication led the members of the Constituent Assembly to make more emphatic the character of their decree on the rights of the Holy See. Someone asked to whom the bishops should henceforth turn for their institution if the annates were suppressed. The Jansenist Camus answered: "The bishops will be confirmed by the metropolitans, the latter by the national council." Thus the Assembly decreed that the diocesans should henceforth address their bishops for all provision of benefices and dispensations. Says Frédéric Masson: "The whole Civil Constitution of the Clergy is to be found in germ in this resolution." [32] But the members of the clergy undoubtedly failed to perceive its full import, and no protest was raised against Camus' proposal.

---

[30] At the session of April 9, 1790, Chasset estimated these revenues of the clergy at 170,000,000 francs. *Moniteur,* I, 412. But Necker, in 1784, put the figure at only 130,000,000. Necker, *De l'administration des finances de la France,* II, 316.

[31] *Journal ecclésiastique* of September, 1789, p. 36.

A frank enthusiasm blinded the best minds. On August 14, in a charge to be read from the pulpit by all priests having the care of souls in the diocese of Paris, Archbishop de Juigné declared: "O ever-memorable epoch in the history of the nation! What you might have beheld, my brethren, taking place on the fourth of this month in the National Assembly! How thankfully you would have seen these representatives of all the estates, of all the provinces and all the cities of the kingdom, animated and transported by love and enthusiasm for the public good, emulating one another in stripping themselves of the most ancient and most precious privileges and rights so as to sacrifice them for the solace of the people and the general happiness of our country!" [33] The Jansenists, on their side, rejoiced at seeing the Church at length "spiritualized" by abandonment of its material riches. The revolutionary Prudhomme wrote in his diary under date of August 16, "France emerges from a long and humiliating slavery." Lastly, the *Moniteur* had the following remark: "In a single night the face of France has changed; in one night the famous tree of feudalism, whose shadow covered all France, has been reversed; in one night a new people seems to have repeopled this vast empire."

The lawmakers were too much encouraged by such approbations for them not to go further. In declaring themselves a Constituent Assembly, they showed their intention of performing a more positive work. On the ruins of the ancient regime they intended to erect a new constitution.

---

[32] Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

[33] *Journal ecclésiastique, loc. cit.*

The Cahiers of the Three Orders

The memorials of grievances drawn up by the three orders furnished them with a natural basis.[34] On several points these memorials were almost unanimous. A division of powers, such as England practiced and such as Montesquieu had extolled; administrative decentralization by suppression of the intendants, of internal customs taxes and of all hindrances to commerce and industry: such were the wishes on which the nobility and the clergy agreed with the Third Estate. But the nobility and the Third Estate differed on the way the taxes should be assessed; and the clergy differed from both by the preponderant place it gave to religion in the social organization.

The Clergy

A capital importance was attached to the memorials of the clergy because of the gravity of their wording and the loftiness of their general inspiration. An attentive study of them reveals the deepest and truest thought of the nation at the close of the eighteenth century. In certain particularly vibrant expressions, we feel the very heart of France beating, as it were, with all the passions then agitating it.

The clergy seemed to be unconcerned with defending the political aspect of the ancient regime. Periodical meetings of the States General, the development of provincial assemblies, and the abolition of *lettres de cachet* formed the program of a liberal political constitution which was not opposed in any of the clergy's memorials. Sometimes a favorable echo of such proposals is found therein.[35] Apparently the clergy were resigned to the fall, not of the monarchy—on the contrary, they asked for its continuance—but of the political part of the ancient regime. What aroused the clergy's solicitude was the danger to the Catholic faith by the growth of unbelief, the corruption of morals, and the lack of zeal in too many priests. The clergy of the Amiens district proposed that an inspection service of publications should be organized under the direction of a commission composed of an upright magistrate, an incorruptible man of letters, and an exact theologian. A certain district of the Midi proposed, as an antidote to the publications of unbelief, the widespread circulation of a popular explanation of Catholic doctrine. Many memorials asked for a closer organization of the clergy by the establishment of diocesan synods and provincial councils and by the formation of special schools of preaching where the young priests would be trained in public speaking.

---

[34] The most complete publication regarding the cahiers of the States General is that issued in 1875 by Madival and Laurent. It appeared first in the *Archives parlementaires*, then separately in six quarto volumes and a seventh volume of tables. The Constituent Assembly ignored most of the cahiers, having under its eyes only the general summary (by Prudhomme and Laurent de Mézières), which was tendentious. Even today we do not possess a complete publication except for ten provinces. See Edme Champion, *La France d'après les cahiers de 1789* (3rd ed., 1907). Cf. Vialay, *Les cahiers de doléances du tiers état en 1789* (1910).

The demands of the clergy for the maintenance of their rights was not without a certain sharpness of expression which they make no attempt to hide. These complaints were evidently discussed, sometimes in stormy sessions, by men who suffered from the social disorder. Where the influence of the upper clergy prevailed, the memorials recall: "with a haughtiness mingled with uneasiness, that the clergy is the first order of the state. The demand is the more insistent as it shelters itself behind the cause of God."[36] When the influence of the lower clergy is dominant, the expressions of grievances sometimes have a vague accent of revolt. Almost everywhere, in the north as well as in the south, in the east as in the west, the curés are plainly rising up against an old edict that gave the bishop the right to impose on his priests a three-month internment in a seminary. Many of the memorials ask that henceforth access to ecclesiastical dignities should be by way of concursus, conditions of age and of length of time in the priesthood. "This desire was altogether just. But the request was anonymous only in appearance. In the eyes of those who framed it, the petition had in mind a definite person, the bishop appointed at too early an age, the vicar general who is utterly ignorant, and the canon promoted at the age of twenty-five, who at that early age began a life of repose."[37]

---

[35] Bishop de Chabot of Saint-Claude, in the assembly of the Aval bailiwick, demanded equality of taxation, the suppression of mortmain, and the reform of the constitution. Cf. A. Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français*, p. 107. Bishop de La Luzerne of Langres spoke out clearly against absolute power, saying: "It is dangerous that there should be only one power in a great nation; for, if this sole power is that of the sovereign, it will degenerate into despotism." *Ibid.*

In many places the bishops made reservations in their memorials. The Bishop of Amiens expressed the fear that the Estates General would contain too few prelates and that the religious questions would be discussed without competence. The Bishop of Evreux protested against the spirit of cabal and insubordination on the part of the curés at the assembly over which he presided. He declared: "Justice cannot mean that a class should exist which, by the superiority of thirty votes against one, would overwhelm the rest." He railed at the presumption of the curés, who, in drawing up of the memorials, prided themselves on being "administrators, jurists, and men of finance."[38]

We should note a curious fact, one that gives us a glimpse of the clergy of France as representative of the whole nation. The acrimony, the rancour, and the half-suppressed rivalries that show through here and there in the documents of this period between the different classes of society do not hinder the touching and sometimes naive unanimity with which prelates and curés ask for whatever can improve the lot of their flocks. A breath of Christian philanthropy pervades these memorials of the clergy of France. In these they request a greater number of asylums for the aged, schools, relief offices, and free distribution of medicine in the country districts. The clergy of Charolles, demanding the maintenance of the monks, emphasize that they are useful for "the relief of families." [39] Everywhere a reaction is manifested against the excessive centralization of the ancient regime. A wish is expressed that the money of the provinces should be spent where it is produced and that the offices and dignities be reserved to people of the district.[40] Everywhere also appear the words "liberty, reform, fraternity, nation, and equality." The frequency of these terms indicates a fermentation of ideas in which the spirit of Christianity and that of the eighteenth-century philosophy are strangely mingled.[41]

---

[36] De La Gorce, *Histoire de la Révolution française,* I, 98.

[37] *Ibid.,* I, 100.

[38] *Archives nationales.* Cf. *ibid.,* I, 101; Mathiez, p. 104.

The theorists of the Assembly intended to establish the basis of the French constitution on these general ideas, which were often ambiguous. Unfortunately they interpreted these ideas in the sense of the rationalist philosophy. The men who succeeded them almost always applied these ideas in a spirit hostile to the Catholic Church. Thus the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which, in the minds of its authors, was to be merely the philosophy of the cahiers of the three orders, became in fact the starting point of measures of persecution taken against religion.[42]

---

[39] Mavidal and Laurent, II, 614.

[40] Grille, *Tableau comparatif des mandats et pouvoirs donnés en 1789 aux représentants de la nation* (1826), Vol. II, *passim.*

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] Barnave, for instance, on the sole basis of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, asked for the suppression of the religious orders. The Legislative Assembly would take the same basis to proclaim divorce.

The Three Principles of the Declaration

In its first session the Assembly decided that the new constitution, in imitation of the American Constitution, should be preceded by a declaration of principles. On August 19, Abbé Sieyès presented a project which "was found too metaphysical by most of the speakers." [43] The meetings on the following days were devoted to the discussion of several other projects. Two philosophical currents then appeared. But the constitutional school, which was connected with Montesquieu and which was represented by Mounier, Lally-Tollendal, Clermont-Tonnerre, and Necker, tried unsuccessfully to have adopted a realistic and moderate policy. The democratic school of Rousseau, defended by Sieyès [44] and Mirabeau, soon won over the majority of the Assembly to its abstract and systematic theories. Says Condorcet: "The method of the mathematical sciences opened new avenues for the political and social sciences." [45] The lawmakers of 1789 seemed to be inspired by this maxim. On August 23, "in the presence of the Supreme Being and under His auspices," there was published the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. This decree had a preamble, which Mirabeau declared to be his work, and seventeen articles. Of these the first three were inspired by Lafayette.[46] These three articles, containing all the essential provisions, from which all the others could be logically deduced, may be summed up in these three words, which express Rousseau's *Contrat social:* liberty, equality, and sovereignty of the people.

Article 1 says: "Men are born and remain free and equal before the law." The most orthodox theologians had long since proclaimed that "all men are equal in nature and that, by nature, no one is either inferior or superior"; but they had been careful to add that the community has received from God the right to transfer the power to one or to many, who will then command each one in the name of God.[47] The revolutionary declaration, on the contrary, seemed to proclaim the primitive liberty and equality as something inalienable.

---

[43] Prudhomme, *Les Révolutions de Paris,* no. 6, p. 36.

[44] Sieyès always denied that he belonged to the school of Rousseau, but he continually got his inspiration from the spirit of the *Contrat social.*

[45] Condorcet, *Tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain,* tenth epoch.

[46] Prudhomme, *op. cit.,* no. 6, p. 37.

Article 3 says: "The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation." Cardinal Bellarmine had taught, in the sixteenth century, that "the public power resides immediately in the multitude as its subject." This doctrine, taught by most scholastic authors, rested on the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas. But the learned Jesuit denied that such a principle implied for the people the perpetual right of revolt.[48] This right is indeed what the lawmakers of 1789, after the example of Rousseau, seemed to affirm.

The radical error, suited to give a revolutionary meaning to the three words, "liberty, equality, popular sovereignty," was found in article 2, restricting the purpose of any political association to the preservation of the natural and inalienable rights of man. Both the whole Catholic school of thought and tradition taught that the purpose of civil society is to assist man, within the sphere of his temporal interests, to accomplish his duties toward God and toward his fellow men. Mirabeau himself, supported by the Jansenist Camus, spoke right when, presenting a project in nineteen articles "intended to establish reason and perfect human liberty," he declared: "What we need to proclaim is not the declaration of rights, but the declaration of duties." [49]

---

[47] *Compendium Salmanticense,* tract. III, *De legibus,* cap. 2, punctum 1, inq. 2. St. Gregory the Great wrote: "Since our Redeemer, the Maker of every creature, vouchsafed to assume human flesh for this end, that . . . He might restore us to pristine liberty, it is a salutary deed if men whom nature originally produced free, and whom the law of nations has subjected to the yoke of slavery, be restored by the benefit of manumission to the liberty in which they were born." *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (1895), XII, 191. Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* III, 105.

[48] On this subject, see Mourret, *op. cit.,* V, 631 f. As regards St. Thomas, see *ibid.,* p. 84.

Less realist on this point than the fiery orator, and more reliant on the wise interpretation of a declaration drawn up "in the presence of the Supreme Being and under His auspices," the members of the clergy did not discern clearly enough the dangers of the formulas they were asked to subscribe to. All of them agreed to these formulas without any thought of making a schism.[50] We have seen Christian kings, in a respectful sense and one not excluding the rights of God and the Church, apply this formula of the jurists, likewise unacceptable in its literal sense, namely, that "the good pleasure of the king has the force of law." [51] Events would soon dispel these illusions.

Development of Anarchy

The proclamation of the rights of man, interpreted in the individualist and rationalist sense which Rousseau's philosophy gave it, was certain to favor the development of the ferments of anarchy which we have already seen appear in the first days of the Constituent Assembly.

The very day when the Declaration was published, the journalist Prudhomme remarked in his paper that the sixty districts of Paris, formed to replace parish boundaries, considered themselves independent authorities, assuming legislative functions and revoking decrees that did not satisfy them. In conclusion he said: "Such are the causes of the anarchy into which we are plunged. Each day aggravates our situation in this respect." [52] Besides the district committees, the clubs and the Masonic lodges also took the initiative into their own hands. Gustave Bord has shown that, as early as the beginning of 1789, the following were Masonic societies, at least through affiliation of their most influential members: the *Société du Port,* whose leading member was Lafayette; the *Société Bergasse,* which paid the expenses of publishing Brissot's pamphlets; the *Société de Viroflay,* which, according to Lameth's Masonic expression, labored "for the progress of lights"; and especially the *Club breton,* the future *Club des jacobins,* which already was preaching "a cavern policy."

---

[49] Mirabeau saw the essential defect of the *Contrat social*. He wrote: "Man is truly man only when society begins to organize itself." On this subject see Faguet, *XVIIIe siècle*, p. 497. On the Declaration of the Rights of Man see Godard, *Les principes de 89 et la doctrine catholique*, and Emile Keller, *Le Syllabus et les principes de 89*.

[50] So said Father Emery. See Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery*, I, 448.

[51] *Quidquid placuit Principi, legis habet vigorem.* Cf. Funck-Brentano, "La popularité et le 'bon plaisir' du roi" in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (October 15, 1911, pp. 926–33). However, since Louis XIV the absolutism was hardly any longer in the person of the king. He found himself in a system, with the king its chief slave. "Slave of his court," wrote Madelin, "slave of his minister and of tradition, the king sometimes aspired to freedom more than his subjects did." L. Madelin, *La Révolution*, p. 4.

About these associations certain more or less spontaneous clubs and groups of wretched men, embittered by misery, provoked frequent alarms. "From the 14th of July, the ministry was dominated by the Assembly; the Assembly, by the clubs; the clubs, by the demagogues; the demagogues, by the armed populace, fanatical and starving, which they thought they were leading but which in reality was driving them before it." [53]

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen merely fanned the fire of these revolutionary undertakings. Basing the entire social organization on the single protection of individual independence, the Declaration intoxicated the "citizens" with their own might. "The divine right of the crowds," according to the words of a certain psychologist, "then pretended to replace the divine right of kings." [54] On

---

[52] Prudhomme, *Révolutions de Paris,* no. 7, pp. 7–9. Cf. *Avant-Moniteur* (made up chiefly of Bailly's *Mémoires*), VII, 9. See Ernest Mellié, *Les sections de Paris pendant la Révolution française.*

[53] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* II, 4.

[54] Gustave Le Bon, *La psychologie des foules,* p. 3.

August 24, Bailly wrote in his *Mémoires:* "Today the distribution of bread was most painful. . . . An uprising of the workmen of Montmartre was feared." [55] The preceding day, Prudhomme wrote in his paper: "We have been free for only one day. Shortly the districts will be peopled only with slaves, and the committees will be composed only of tyrants." [56]

A sort of feverish excitement stirred the man of the people as well as the bourgeois and accompanied him even in the common pastimes of his daily life. In the paper having the widest circulation at that time, under date of August 25, 1789, we read: "At Paris they are having the visit of the paintings on exhibition at the Louvre. The number of visitors is smaller than in preceding years. In fact, the allegories of love, the portraits of courtiers, the flatteries of slaves, all these are of little interest to us. Henceforth Brutus, pronouncing the death of his son, or Decius, dying for his country, are subjects that will appeal to us." [57]

Four Destructions

In the presence of such a disorganization and such a state of effervescence, four traditional powers, if wisely restored, might have effectively withstood the rising flood of anarchy. These controlling factors were the royal power, the authority of the judiciary bodies, the influence of the professional corporations, and the ascendancy of the clergy, regular and secular. The Assembly strove to destroy each of these forces, one after the other.

Here we shall do no more than summarily recall how the first three destructions were accomplished. In the presence of the constitutional projects that practically annihilated the royal power, Bailly wrote, under date of August 28: "It seems to me that the result of the constitution is a democratic monarchy or a royal democracy." [58]

---

[55] *Avant-Moniteur,* p. civ.

[56] Prudhomme, *op. cit.,* no. 7, p. 11. The avowal is notable. In preaching man's duties, the gospel had trained free souls; in proclaiming only man's rights, the Revolution was preparing slaves and tyrants.

[57] *Ibid.,* no. 7, p. 18.

At the side of kings, the parliaments had constituted very potent powers. A law of November 3, 1789, decreed their adjournment *sine die,* and these "sovereign courts," as they were called, which more than once had dared to withstand the might of kings and even that of the popes, let themselves be dissolved. Some of them did so after a few vain protests; others, as the parliament at Toulouse, deplored "the irresistible force of circumstances." Persons might have said that they felt themselves powerless in the presence of a revolutionary movement which they had favored in spite of themselves by their principles and often by their attitude.

The corporations of arts and crafts were also a strong social force. For the working classes they constituted a sort of nobility, sometimes hereditary, which gave the profession and the individual a dignity they were rightly proud of. But in 1789 these corporations went through a hard crisis. A royal edict of 1776 had reorganized them according to a plan that quite changed them. The edict established, besides the organized professions, free professions, admitted women to the mastership, lowered by two-thirds, sometimes by three-fourths, the payments for admission, and provided for the election of the administrators and syndics, thereafter assisted by a permanent council. "We may well believe that if the time should have come to consolidate the work of the royal edict, the societies would have acquired the unity and cohesion that had been the strength of their predecessors, and this without deserving the same criticism or falling into the same abuses." [59] Unhappily they had not emerged from their period of transition when the Revolution broke out. Unable to reorganize themselves amid the ceaseless disturbances, they found themselves actually destroyed when (June 14, 1791) the Le Chapelier law suppressed them legally, forbidding workmen to "form regulations about their so-called common interests."

---

[58] *Avant-Moniteur,* p. cvi. In the declaration the democratic school of Rousseau prevailed. But in the constitution the constitutional school of Montesquieu guided the provisions. Hence resulted a contradictory dualism, which was expressed by the formula of the letters patent: "Louis, by the grace of God and by the constitutional law of the state, King of the French." But little by little the King will be disarmed, and the nation will be provided with formidable weapons.

One institution remained, the Church, with its immense religious ascendancy and its undeniable power. By its vast possessions, valued at 3,000,000,000 francs,[60] it had continually remained in permanent contact with the people. Its great monasteries and the sumptuous palaces of its bishops, not only imposed respect by their massiveness or their fine architecture, but also had poured out, in times of distress, the most generous alms. And the little curacies and humble chaplaincies, where poor priests courageously shared the hard life of the populations to whom they ministered, had made the influence of the Church reach into the remotest country districts.

Three important decrees of the Constituent Assembly aimed at destroying that power. By the decree of November 2, 1789, which placed all ecclesiastical property at the disposal of the nation, by that of February 13, 1790, which suppressed the vows of religion, and by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (July 12, 1790), which made even the ministry of the clergy dependent on the state, the Constituent Assembly did not fear to attack this last rampart of the Christian faith, of the social order, and of true liberty.

---

[59] Martin Saint-Léon, *Histoire des corporations,* p. 593.

[60] According to Chasset's report, the clergy possessed a fifth of the landed property. *Moniteur,* I, 412. De La Gorce says 2,992,538,400 livres. "After examining the different evidences," writes Madelin, "we must grant that De La Gorce is right. The annual revenue was 85,000,000 francs. But this sum was almost doubled by the tithes, which amounted to about 80,000,000 francs." Louis Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 6.

Church Property

Of course, since the formation of the National Assembly the clergy no longer existed as the first order of the state. But its immense landed possessions might, so it was said, render it formidable. Moreover, on this point as on many other points, the jurists and the philosophers of the ancient regime had prepared for the Revolution. In 1749 an edict forbade any bequest in favor of the Church and decided that acquisitions by gift or with any obligation attached would not be valid except by special authorization.[61] In the *Encyclopedia,* Turgot proclaimed the right of the government, for reasons of public utility, to suppress all foundations.[62] In certain districts the lower clergy vaguely adopted these views, declaring that small ecclesiastical properties were sacred and inalienable, and letting it be understood that the same restriction did not apply absolutely to large properties.

On August 6, following the generous sacrifice which the clergy had just made of the revenues, one of the deputies, Buzot, ventured this remark: "I hold that all ecclesiastical property belongs to the nation." Two days later Marquis de La Coste repeated the same thing. But these words did not then find any response. Public opinion was not ready for an immediate spoliation. Three months afterward, when the question was put clearly before the representatives of the nation, even those who most eagerly desired the ruin of the Church or its political subjection to the civil power had to avoid so shocking an expression of their views. They enveloped their thought in clever circumlocutions. To obtain the votes of the other members they will be obliged to offer reasons of a political and economic order.

---

[61] Isambert, *Anciennes lois françaises,* XXII, 226. Louis XIV said in his *Mémoires:* "The kings are absolute lords of all the goods, whether of seculars or of ecclesiastics, to use them according to the needs of the state."

[62] Under the word *Fondations,* VII, 75.

The Assembly was divided into committees. The formation of an ecclesiastical committee showed from the start the desire to give a large place to the religious questions. But the composition of this committee gave reason to fear that these questions would be settled only in a Jansenist, Gallican, and rationalist sense. The committee had eleven members, six of them lawyers. Among these we find four men already known for their opposition to the Roman doctrines: Durand de Maillane, Lanjuinais, Treilhard, and Martineau.

Durand, born at Saint-Rémy in Provence in 1729, had been a lawyer in the Aix parliament. His reputation was that of an honest and learned magistrate, and his name was well known to the public by a commentary, published in 1771, on Pierre Pithou's articles concerning the Gallican liberties, and by several works on canon law. In these writings the doctrines of the most radical Gallicanism were plainly professed. Canon law was also the subject to which the lawyer Lanjuinais applied himself particularly. In the two Latin works that he wrote on canon law, according to the testimony of his son Victor, "his sole desire was to revive the faith by a return to the discipline of the first centuries."

Less scholarly than Durand de Maillane, but a man of no less probity and austerity, Lanjuinais, descended from an old Breton family, would show throughout his life, in defense of his ideas, the proverbial tenacity of the people of Brittany. We shall see him in the Convention, during the uprising of May 31, 1793, after being thrown down from the rostrum, mount it again and cling there amid pistols and fisticuffs. John Baptist Treilhard, son of a sculptor of Brives, unlike Durand and Lanjuinais, did not profess an austere Christianity. Rather his ideas attached him to irreligious philosophy. His uncouth appearance, his slow and at first hesitant manner of speech, were not in his favor. But his deep knowledge of affairs and his remarkable suppleness of mind would soon win for him a particular influence in the committee and in the assembly. The Parisian lawyer Martineau had the reputation of being an active, hard-working, and scholarly man, who openly professed the purest Catholic faith. His Jansenism seems to have been beyond doubt.[63] On this point we have precise evidence, not only in the testimony of his contemporaries [64] and in his own explicit approval of the official journal of Jansenism,[65] but also in the very text of his report and discourses. The influence of these four men, in whom the Gallican spirit, the Jansenist spirit, and the philosophical spirit of the age were fused in their defiance of Rome and in their jealous attachment to so-called national liberties, would be decisive in the revolutionary legislation regarding the clergy.

Talleyrand

But the person who, in the Assembly, brought up the question of ecclesiastical property was not one of these men. That role would belong to a member of the frivolous society of the eighteenth century, to a member of the upper clergy and the high nobility, Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, bishop of Autun. Nothing seemed to designate Maurice de Talleyrand for this audacious project. "Formerly as general agent of the clergy,[66] he had proclaimed the domain of the Church inalienable. At the beginning of the States General he had backed the court, advised resistance, and only later on rallied to the National Assembly. The devastation that followed July 14 reached him even in his personal interests: the Sénozan château, one of the finest in the Mâconnais district, which was burned down on July 28, was a possession of his family." [67] But the later events made him give more and more significant approval to the new ideas. Chosen a member of the constitution committee along with Sieyès, Mounier, and Lally-Tollendal, he had, by virtue of his position, taken an active part in the formulation of the famous Declaration of the Rights of Man. A priest without a sacerdotal vocation,[68] Talleyrand was advanced to the episcopacy by reason of his administrative services and in spite of the notorious disorder of his morals. He was more daring than deep, indifferent to the means employed and almost to the purpose intended, if only he found some personal success therein.[69] His complete change of attitude, which would be followed by many other such changes during the rest of his life,[70] was not otherwise mysterious. The cause of the ancient regime now appeared to him to be lost. Having nothing to hope from it, he separated from it with a grand flourish and gave himself unreservedly to the movement of the future. The more his antecedents made him an object of suspicion, the more striking must now be his pledge to the victorious party.

---

[63] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[64] See Abbé de Bonneval's testimony in *Etudes* for April 20, 1907, pp. 263, 267.

[65] "Martineau's report was strongly applauded. . . . Nothing could be more judicious or more conformable to the spirit of the Church." *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* of July 24, 1790, pp. 117–19.

[66] The general agents of the clergy, instituted at the close of the sixteenth century, were the permanent delegates of the clergy to the royal authority. They were in continual correspondence with the dioceses. On this important institution, see L. Serbat, *Les Assemblées du clergé de France*, pp. 178–89.

---

[67] De La Gorce, *op. cit.,* I, 140. Cf. Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 129 ff.; Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionel,* p. 217; Bernard de Lacombe, *Talleyrand, évêque d'Autun.*

[68] "My parents, according to what they considered a family interest, decided to lead me to a state of life for which I showed no disposition." Talleyrand, *Mémoires* (published by Duke de Broglie, 1891), I, 16. Talleyrand reveals the depth of his soul and the mentality of the age when, a little further on, he writes; "Youth is the period of life when a person has the greatest uprightness. I did not yet understand what it was to enter into a state of life with the intention of following another, to go to the seminary for the purpose of becoming minister of finance. . . . But I had no means of defense; my entire surroundings had ready-made answers for all my objections. My weary spirit resigned itself: I let myself be brought to the seminary of St. Sulpice." *Ibid.,* p. 19. Count de Choiseul relates that, being at Talleyrand's house the evening before the latter's ordination to the priesthood, he found him in a violent state of interior struggle, of tears and despair. The Count then made every effort to dissuade him from going on. But Talleyrand's fear of his mother and of a public sensation at his tardy change of mind, as also a false shame, deprived him of courage. He exclaimed: "It is too late for me to withdraw." Note of M. de Bacour, inserted in Talleyrand's *Mémoires* by Duke de Broglie, I, 23.

[69] Guizot, *Mémoires,* I, 37.

[70] On Talleyrand's conversion shortly before his death, see Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup,* I, 234–58. Cf. Baron de Nervo, *La conversion de Talleyrand,* and the *Mémoires de Talleyrand* (edited by Duke de Broglie), V, 482–84.

On October 10 the Bishop of Autun, with that slow and jerky step which lost nothing of its distinction because of a slight lameness, mounted the parliamentary rostrum. He then read a bill directing the sale of all the landed property of the clergy for the benefit of the state, the state being charged with assuring the subsistence of the pillaged ecclesiastics. As we learn from contemporary witnesses, the gentleman prelate with a flexible and almost caressing voice, delivered a fatal blow to the Church, of which he was one of the high dignitaries.

His arguments were chiefly of a financial sort; the economic situation of France was indeed almost desperate. In spite of Mirabeau's eloquent apostrophe: "Bankruptcy is at your gate . . . and still you deliberate," two loans, one of 30,000,000 francs and the other of 80,000,000 had not been subscribed; the "patriotic contribution of a fourth" of the revenue had produced nothing. But the debt rose to a billion and a half francs. After enumerating the resources that seemed to him insufficient, the Bishop of Autun added:

> An immense resource remains, one that does not violate rights of ownership; the property of the clergy. . . . The clergy are not owners after the manner of other owners. . . . The portion of these goods required for the decent sustenance of the clergy is all that belongs to them; the rest is the property of the temples and the poor. If, then, the nation reserves an honorable subsistence to each holder of a benefice, of whatever nature, this policy is sure not to infringe any true ownership. By assuming responsibility for administering the rest, and by fulfilling the obligations attached to it—such as the support of hospitals and of charitable workshops, the repair of church edifices—the

intentions of the founders will be carried out, and every demand of justice will be strictly observed.

The Assembly seemed to be impressed by this clever sophism. Then De Boisgelin arose. In less elegant language but in a graver tone and loftier attitude, he rightly noted that the goods had been given, not to the Church, but to various institutions —abbeys, curacies, hospitals, colleges—for precise purposes. A few days later the Archbishop of Aix again mounted the rostrum to offer, in the name of his order, a sum of 400,000,000 francs to hypothecate on the ecclesiastical property. The financial argument fell of itself, and all the prejudices against the so-called selfishness of the clergy should have fallen at the same time.

A deputy from Rennes, La Chapelier by name, then resolutely placed the question on the political terrain. According to him, the important thing was not so much to balance the finances of France, but rather to prevent the political preponderance of the clergy. "You wished to destroy the orders," he declared, "because their destruction was necessary for the security of the state. If the clergy keeps its property, the clerical order is not destroyed. The clergy offer gifts. Be suspicious of this pledge. The clergy wish to rise from their ashes that they may again form themselves into an order." To cut short this so-called peril, Mirabeau for a moment entertained the idea of having the nation proclaimed the proprietor of the goods of the clergy. But the step was too radical. It stirred lively protests.

Abbé Maury

The most eloquent objection was that of Abbé Maury. Disclosing the secret influences that were affecting many of his fellow deputies, he showed that the proposed measure would be the triumph of the speculators. He pointed out that these men were accustomed to profit from the ills of the state, "speculating on the ruin of the clergy, silently waiting for this rich prey that was being prepared for them, devouring these properties in advance, watching impatiently for the time when the sale of Church property, by raising the value of the government securities, would thereupon suddenly increase their fortune." [71]

Maury next denounced the harmful consequences, social, religious, and political, that would follow the spoliation of the clergy. He said:

> We have usurped nobody's possessions. Our possessions belong to us because we have acquired them or because they have been given to us. . . . But ownership is one, and is as sacred for us as it is for you. Our right of ownership guarantees yours. We can produce the titles of our acquisitions. We came into them under the express authorization of the laws. . . . If the nation can go back to the origin of society to strip us of our possessions, recognized and protected by the laws for fourteen centuries, this new metaphysical principle will lead to all the insurrections of the agrarian law; the people will take advantage of the chaos to demand the partition of your possessions.

But will not religion recover its ancient purity in consequence of this spoliation? Not at all, said the orator. "The public worship will be compromised if it depends on a declining and uncertain salary. Soon irreligion and cupidity will reduce the price of these functions and will seek the least costly worship and will finally come to the suppression of any worship at all." Maury concluded his solid and brilliant address, one of the finest masterpieces of parliamentary eloquence, by showing "the kingdom given over to anarchy and soon learning from its disasters this great truth, that political order rests on religion and that the ministers of public worship are the only ones who can truly voice the sentiments of the people." He finally pointed to the Kingdom of England, which, "after usurping the possessions of the richest dioceses and chapters of Europe, was obliged to replace the alms of the clergy by the taxation of the poor." [72]

---

[71] Picot, *op. cit.*, V, 389.

The discussion was interrupted by the removal of the Assembly from Versailles to Paris, where it was resumed under more unfavorable conditions. To the disorder resulting from the large number of members, the vast size of the assembly chamber, and the general tense excitement of men's minds, were added the disorders provoked by the frequent invasion of the hall by the mob. In fact, from the time of their installation at Paris, the members of the Constituent Assembly were almost continually under the insolent control and sometimes the threatening influence of the clubs, the district committees, and the unorganized mobs, which disturbed the deliberations by their applause or their hoots, hindering or dictating the laws according to their passions or their whims.

Before dawn on November 2, the day when the discussion was to close, the Assembly hall was surrounded by a riotous populace. But Mirabeau, who was never without a clear-sighted political sense, recoiled before the rejection of his first proposal. He abandoned the hope of seeing the Assembly decree that the goods of the clergy were the property of the nation. The proposed decree said: "The National Assembly decrees that all ecclesiastical goods are at the disposal of the nation." [73] In this form the decree was passed by a vote of 368 to 346. Forty members present abstained from voting. Three hundred deputies, almost the whole right and center, frightened by the uprising, did not attend the session.

---

[72] Maury, *Œuvres choisies,* III, 380. Le Chapelier had said: "The clergy exercises but a sterile and perilous charity. The nation, on the contrary, will establish in its houses of prayer and of repose some workshops useful to the state, where the poor man will find his subsistence by work. No longer will we have wretches except those who wish to be so."

[73] These goods were placed at the disposal of the nation, which assumed the following obligations: 1. that suitable provision be made for the expenses of public worship, the support of its ministers, and the relief of the poor, under the watchfulness and according to the instructions of the parishes; 2. that, in the arrangements for providing suitable support of the ministers of religion, no pastor of souls shall be allotted less than 1,200 livres a year, besides living accommodations and the gardens attached thereto."

The new wording of the measure removed much of the opposition. The next day one of the most intelligent members of the minority, Boisgelin, wrote as follows to the Countess de Gramont: "I have won three points: 1. The law does not state that the property belongs to the nation, but merely that the goods of the clergy are at the disposal of the nation; 2. in the views expressed, the idea of alienation was given up; 3. and also the idea of government administration of this property." Yet in the same letter the Archbishop of Aix also said: "The cause of the clergy is lost." [74]

He wrote truly. Laws are of avail less by their wording than by the spirit in which those words are applied. In fact, Mirabeau's second formula was considered equivalent to the first.

The decree of November 2, by placing the ecclesiastical possessions "at the disposal of the nation," did not regulate the measures the government would take in the matter. From November 19, 1790, to March 19, 1793, a series of decrees would mark the progress of the most brutal and complete spoliation.

The simple enumeration of these legislative acts is sadly eloquent. On November 19, the property valued at 400,000,000 francs was put on sale. Two decrees (April 14 and 16) transferred the administration of these properties from the clergy to the departments or the districts. A month later the procedure to be followed was made precise: with a view to facilitating the operations, the purchasers could enter into possession after a down payment which, in the case of rural real estate, must be merely one-twelfth.

But this alienation of 400,000,000 francs' worth of property was soon judged insufficient. Subsequent decrees (June 24, 26,

---

[74] Quoted by Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante,* p. 85.

29, and July 9) ordered the total sale, except of property belonging to the fabrics (church boards), colleges, seminaries, and hospitals. This exception, however, was not of long duration. The Constituent Assembly decided (May 6, 1791) on the sale of the suppressed churches. The Legislative Assembly and the Convention decreed as follows: (July 19, 1792) the sale of the episcopal palaces; (July 31 and August 7) the sale of houses occupied by the religious; (August 19) the sale of the property of the fabrics; (March 8, 1793) the sale of the possessions of all ecclesiastical establishments of public education; (March 19) the property of the hospitals. This series of enactments brought about the destruction of a large number of works of social welfare, but it did not succeed in balancing the budget. However, the men of the Revolution could tell themselves that the influence of the clergy as a political body was indeed ruined at its very foundation and that a multitude of purchasers of ecclesiastical property was henceforth closely bound to the cause of the Revolution by their own material interests.[75]

The way these decrees were applied added to their odious character. In some provinces the peasants and the bourgeois pounced upon the ecclesiastical property with scandalous avidity. The most shameful speculation became involved in the affair. The sale of these properties was combined with that of the possessions of the *émigrés*. A sudden drop in the price of landed property took place. Immense estates were sold at ridiculously low prices. One day someone said to Mirabeau: "You cannot sell all these lands at one time." "Very well," he replied, "we will give them away." The people, fascinated at the sight of so much property being put on sale, were the victims of almost incredible illusions. We are told that in the Aisne a hairdresser bought an immense domain belonging to the Abbey of Saint-Quentin-en-l'Ile; a baker purchased two large properties of Saint-Nicholas-aux-Bois. What happened then? Generally these purchasers were unable to furnish even the first payment of a twelfth as required before entering into possession. At this point the speculator slipped in. He replaced the insolvent purchaser by a second insolvent one, then by a third. By means of fictitious purchasers he continued to lower the price. Finally, at the favorable moment, he himself appeared as purchaser and profited by the depreciation of the property value. Such was a man named Marlier who, from February to December, 1791, counted no less than 197 transactions in his name. These purchases amounted to more than 2,000,000 francs.[76]

---

[75] On January 10, Thomas Lindet wrote: "The assignats will soon be scattered. Their holders will, in spite of themselves, become defenders of the Revolution." "This operation," said the reporter of the law, "is going to bind all the citizens to the public interests." Cf. Madelin, *La Révolution*, p. 121.

We need not say that the state finances were not benefited by these operations. Maury exclaimed: "A person does not inherit from those he murders." Yet the majority of the Constituent Assembly had instituted a "bank of extraordinary deposits" to receive the proceeds of these alienations. This bank was authorized to issue, pending the receipt of the funds, "assignats" guaranteed by the proceeds from the sale of the national properties. We know the discredit that befell these promissory notes, a debacle recalling that of Law.[77] As for the clergy, reduced to the receipt of an indemnity which Burke called "miserable," they presently felt their prestige lessened by the condition of a salaried official to which the government reduced them. Bishop Le Mintier of Tréguier declared: "The Church has fallen into servitude; its ministers are threatened with being reduced to the condition of appointed commissioners." Maury's eloquent predictions and Boisgelin's sad presentiments were fully realized.[78]

---

[76] Abbé Sicard, "La spoliation du clergé sous la Révolution," *Correspondant* (October 10, 1911). At the abbey of Dammartin, of the Premonstratensian Order, in the diocese of Aurens, a scandalous scene occurred. From the neighboring villages the peasants precipitated themselves on the place to pillage and destroy everything. At Saint-Omer the reredos of the high altar of St. Bertin's church, painted by Memling, was bought by a baker for a few cents.

[77] Cf. Pisani, *op. cit.*, I, 136.

The Religious Orders

The Assembly had undertaken to reduce the secular clergy to the condition of salaried employees of the state. It tried to make the regular clergy simply pensioners of the state.

In attempting to regulate the religious orders, the Constituent Assembly could appeal to some precedents in the ancient regime. Apart from the measures taken against the Society of Jesus,[79] the King's Council (May 26, 1765) had appointed a commission of five prelates and five state councilors and entrusted to them the strange mission of reforming all the religious communities of men in the Kingdom. This commission prepared an ordinance (March 24, 1768) which decided: 1. that the age for vows would be set at twenty years for men, eighteen for women; 2. that all the religious must be French; 3. that not more than two houses of the same order can be in one city; 4. that each monastery must have at least fifteen religious. This commission, called the Commission of Regulars, functioned from 1768 to 1790; and the decree of March 24 was not a dead letter. In 1790 it had suppressed nine congregations,[80] and the four orders that followed the rule of St. Francis of Assisi had lost 3,756 professed members.[81]

---

[78] The question of the sale of the national properties has been the object of an open concursus by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. Three of the crowned *mémoires* appeared in 1908. They are: Marcel Marcon, *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution;* G. Lecarpentier, *La vente des biens ecclésiastiques pendant la Révolution;* A. Vialay, *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution.* On the same subject, see an article by M. de Lanzac de Laborie in the *Correspondant* (December 25, 1908); that by E. Sicard in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* (July, 1906).

[79] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* VI, Index.

[80] C. Gérin, "Les monastères franciscains et la commission des réguliers," *Revue des questions historiques,* XVIII (1875), 88. Cf. Prat, *Essai historique sur la destruction des ordres religieux en France au XVIII^e^ siècle.*

In some monasteries where regular observance had become lax, the religious were quite agreeable to the secularization measures. On September 26, 1789, a representative read to the Assembly an amazing letter, signed by thirteen Cluny monks living in the monastery of Saint-Martin-des-Champs at Paris. After offering to transfer the property of their monastery to the possession of the state in return for the assurance of an annual pension of 1,500 francs, they expressed "their desire for liberty, which they wished to enjoy like other Frenchmen." The official account of this session of the Assembly states that the Assembly "has gratefully received these proofs of patriotism." [82] A month later (October 25) a committee reported to the Assembly about letters written by two monks and by one nun, protesting against perpetual vows. Then a law was passed declaring that "all taking of vows should be suspended in all monasteries and convents." As the clergy noted at the time, this suspension was tantamount to utter suppression of vows.[83]

One of the chief concerns of the ecclesiastical committee, which (1790) took up the work of the commission on regulars,[84] was to open an inquiry about the situation of the religious orders in France. The calculations of several historians tend to establish the fact that France then counted 60,000 religious of both sexes,[85] with 4,000 religious houses.[86] We find difficulty in expressing with a single phrase the spirit that prevailed in these houses. In one place would be found the most rigorous fervor, as in the Benedictine abbey of Marolles in the diocese of Cambrai. There, upon receiving word that the magistrates would come to question them, the monks solemnly met together, read their formula of profession, and again vowed to live and die in the life they had freely embraced.[87]

---

[81] Gérin, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[82] Picot, *Mémoires*, V, 381.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 391.

[84] This had been suppressed by Louis XVI.

[85] De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 168; Taine, *Les origines*, I, 321. The men religious were about 25,000; the nuns were about 37,000. We may estimate the secular clergy at about 70,000. France then counted a population of 24,000,000.

[86] Of these houses, 2,489 were for men, 1,500 for women. Taine, *ibid.*

In a few monasteries the laxity was scandalous. Such was the Preuilly abbey, where the prior, upon learning of the decree suppressing religious vows, wrote, in the name of his ten monks: "As my fellow monks and I are all zealous partisans of the present Revolution, we await merely the first signal to depart from this house."[88] In many places the good religious were equally without the heroic ardor that is ready to face martyrdom and without the laxity that is ready to desert the cloister. An old monk of Tarascon wished "to end his career in peace." Some, in the style of the time, expressed their "deep concern over being separated from their beloved confreres." As a whole the monks of the ancient regime at first gave an example neither of heroism nor of laxity. But, as though suddenly awakened from their lukewarm tranquillity, many of these religious, who had entered the cloister with a doubtful or unreflecting vocation, showed regrettable hesitation. Soon, in the presence of open persecution, they would feel an awakening of their former languid faith and would then resist even to exile, even to martyrdom. The nuns especially would rise to a degree of heroism worthy of the finest ages of faith.[89]

However, the left wing of the Assembly became impatient with the slowness of the ecclesiastical committee. The fiery opposition of Lanjuinais, Durand de Maillane, and Treilhard against the religious was vigorously countered by the bishops of Clermont and Luçon in the committee. On February 4, 1790, on the pretext that the fifteen members of the committee were overburdened with work, Treilhard proposed that the number should be doubled. The fifteen new members, appointed three days later, were almost entirely from the left. The Jacobite spirit was then in the majority.[90] After this manner the right refused to collaborate any longer in the work of the committee. The bishops of Clermont and Luçon withdrew from it. Treilhard, whose determined aim had long been to have the religious orders suppressed, then had free rein. On December 17, during the discussion of the decree applying the 400,000,000 francs' worth of property of the clergy to pay the debts of the state, he proposed that religious vows be no longer recognized, that the monasteries be suppressed, and that pensions be granted to the religious who should wish to leave their monasteries. About a month later he succeeded in having his proposal advanced to its second reading.

---

[87] Documents of the ecclesiastical committee. Quoted by De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 171.

[88] *Ibid.*

[89] This judgment regarding the monastic spirit at the close of the eighteenth century is founded on investigations made by De La Gorce in the *National Archives*, in the documents of the ecclesiastical committee. See De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 160–79.

The debate was most spirited. Amid murmurs, laughter, and even hooting, Bishop de Bonal of Clermont and Bishop de La Fare of Nancy offered the Assembly the most judicious and lofty reflections. The Bishop of Clermont declared: "The religious who would take advantage of your decree before being authorized to do so by the spiritual authority would be failing in their most sacred obligations. Your decree would be a temptation that is unworthy of you to offer them. . . . A sad philosophy indeed, that would regard as contrary to the rights of man for him to be able to offer his liberty in homage to Him to whom we owe everything. . . . Ought we to cut down a tree that has borne such excellent fruits, on account of a few parasitic branches?" The Bishop of Nancy pointed out that a project which would ultimately increase the financial burden of the state and would disturb the divine worship was condemned both by sound politics and by religion.

---

[90] Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé,* p. 98.

But the most violent passions were let loose. In the name of the left, Barnave arose and declared that he considered the committee's project too moderate. He proposed to suppress, without reservation or delay, all the monastic orders.[91] In a thundering voice Garat shouted: "I swear that I have never conceived how God can wish to repress in man the first of the goods He has bestowed on him, namely, liberty." [92] These words stirred up a tumult. The right, through the Bishop of Nancy, Count de Cazales, and several others, demanded that "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion be declared the national religion." "Such a proposal," declared Charles de Lameth, "is a conspiracy against the tranquillity of the people." [93] M. de Menon added that the motion by the Bishop of Nancy tended to nothing less than a revival of the wars of religion.[94] Two hours and a half passed in this turmoil. Twice the president's bell was broken.[95]

The decree was passed. It began thus: "Article 1. The National Assembly decrees, as a constitutional article, that the law no longer recognizes solemn monastic vows for either sex. Hence it declares that the orders in which such vows are made are and shall remain suppressed in France, without any such being allowed to be established in the future. Article 2. All individuals of either sex residing in the religious houses will be free to leave them upon making their declaration before the municipal authority of the place." To each mendicant religious that should depart from the cloister was granted 700 francs, 800 francs, or 1,000 francs according to his age. Abbé de Montesquieu had an amendment adopted, which included the Jesuits among the religious of mendicant orders for the purpose of this decree. He said: "You will not refuse your justice to this famous congregation, whose faults have been a problem and whose misfortunes are not a problem." [96] Moreover, religious who should leave their religious house were declared incapable of benefiting by any testamentary provisions; they could receive only pensions or life annuities.[97] This perfidious provision resulted in making the former religious closely dependent on the state. Shortly afterward a new decree showed still more plainly the intentions of the authors of the law. Such former religious as should refuse to take the constitutional oath or who should retract it after taking it, would be deprived of their pension. Thus the lawmaker, after offering a premium for the violation of the oaths which the religious had taken to God and to the Church, penalized, by the privation of their last means of subsistence, the violation of the oaths which they had been obliged to take to the Revolution.

---

[91] *Moniteur* (February 14, 1790), p. 181.

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[93] *Ibid.*

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[95] *Mercure de France* (February 20, 1790). Cf. Aulard, *La Révolution française et les Congregations*, p. 16.

Under these liberal appearances, the law by which the state no longer recognized monastic vows did in fact provoke the ruin of the religious life in France. Of course, the voluntary departure of monks without vocation, for whom the monastic discipline was an ill-tolerated yoke, and the exodus of those who were disturbed by the revolutionary utopias would not have been an evil for the Church of France. But other causes determined the dispersion of the religious. The decree of February 13 had dried up the recruiting of the monasteries. Subsequent decrees (March 20 and 26, 1790, and January 2 and 4, 1791) enacted that the collective properties of the congregations must be absorbed in the national patrimony since these congregations had ceased legally to exist. It was also decided (February 8 and 12, 1791) that all the subjects belonging to any one order should be gathered together in a single house. This last provision of itself led to several departures, since the houses thus combined by legislative authority had often not the same rules and the same customs. But especially the uncertainty of the future and the evidently provisional character of the asylum offered to the persevering monks prompted several religious to withdraw to their families or to the homes of trustworthy friends, not with a view of abjuring their promises, but, on the contrary, to lead there a life more in conformity with their vows. A certain number resolved to join that courageous party of the clergy which, after refusing to take the oath, exercised their ministry in secret amid continual perils. This existence, which became more and more dangerous, necessitated a wandering life at the mercy of spies and informers.[98] The statistics of the dispersed religious, if interpreted in a sense of a total defection, would be misleading.[99] Thus we might wrongly take as apostates those who were in reality most courageous apostles.

---

[96] *Mercure de France* (February 27, 1790).

[97] Picot, *op. cit.,* V, 412. Before the vote was taken, Garat obtained the floor and said: "I declare myself as good a Catholic Apostolic Christian as anyone. . . . And I joyously approve the desire to suppress the religious orders." *Moniteur* (February 15), p. 186.

Church and State

But the ecclesiastical committee, under the inspiration of Treilhard, had not yet spoken its last word. A certain historian, who had made himself the defender of the religious policy of the Constituent Assembly, says so directly:

> Nobody can doubt that one of the chief aims of this legislation was to give the Church of France a life independent of Rome. To dispute the pronounced Gallicanism of the Constituent Assembly would be a childish undertaking. Certainly the members, with much sincerity and persistence, intended to bring the Church and state together as closely

---

[98] Pisani, *op. cit.*, I, 146–48.

[99] A table which appears to date from 1790 indicates, for the city of Paris, 451 secularizations out of 943 religious. Pisani, *op. cit.*, I, 146. Encouragements for defection were not lacking. On February 20, 1790, Prudhomme wrote in his journal: "The first person who marries one of these former nuns would, in our opinion, deserve a civic crown." *Révolutions de Paris,* no. 30.

> as possible, and even to merge one with the other. . . . On the one hand, to free the Church of France from subjection to Rome; on the other hand, to nationalize that Church and make it the moral tutor and safeguard of the new political regime: such was their profound intent.[100]

The decree of November, 1789, on ecclesiastical property, and the decree of February 13, 1790, on religious vows, were the first acts of this policy. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was its complete realization.

On the regulations of the relations of Church and state, understood in the Gallican sense, the men of the ecclesiastical committee found more than mere indications in the ancient regime. They found there a whole code of regulations, which was the collection of the famous articles of Pierre Pithou.[101] Durand de Maillane had written a learned commentary on them in five big volumes. More recently, in 1786, the Synod of Pistoia had formulated, with regard to the civil power in Church affairs, certain reckless maxims continually applauded in the Jansenist paper, *Les nouvelles ecclésiastiques.* Several of the eighteenth-century philosophers had surpassed the Gallican and Jansenist doctrines about ecclesiastical law. Voltaire, their spokesman, wrote to the Russian Schowalof: "Only your illustrious sovereign is right: she pays the priests; she opens their mouth and closes it; they are under her orders; and everything is tranquil." [102]

Ever since Treilhard's clever maneuver assured a powerful majority of the left in the ecclesiastical committee, the jurists and canonists composing it had patiently worked out a whole series of laws on the organization of the clergy and the administration of their property. In this labor the canonist Durand de Maillane had been actively seconded by two men who would soon play an important part in the wording and application of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy: one was a Parisian lawyer, Martineau; the other would be the principal author of the Civil Constitution. Expilly would be the first of the constitutional prelates to receive episcopal consecration.

---

[100] Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante,* p. 78.

[101] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* VI, 325.

[102] Letter of December 3, 1768. The context is significant. "The time has come for the monster of superstition to be chained. The Catholic princes are beginning to repress its undertakings to some extent. But instead of cutting off the hydra's heads, they merely bite its tail. They still recognize two powers, or at least feign to do so, and they are not daring enough to declare that the Church must depend solely on the laws of the sovereign. . . . Only your august ruler is right." Voltaire, *Œuvres* (Beuchot ed., 1883), LXV, 250.

Divided into three sections, the members of the committee, because of a work assiduously and methodically carried out, were able, between the middle of February and the beginning of April, to sketch the general lines of their project. About the end of May three reports were presented to the Assembly: the first, on the constitution to be given the clergy, by Martineau; the second, on the salaries to be granted the ministers of worship, by Abbé Expilly; the third, on foundations and patronage,[103] by Durand de Maillane. The first of these was unquestionably the most important.

The report started with a magnificent eulogy of "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, handed down to our fathers by the first successors of the apostles, itself incorruptible, which still teaches what it always taught from its birth and will always teach."[104] After this hymn to Catholicism, Martineau called upon the reforming hand of the lawmaker to regulate the external discipline of the Church. He said: "The plan of regeneration that we have the honor to propose to you will consist solely in a return to the discipline of the primitive Church."[105]

---

[103] In the matter of benefices, patronage consisted in the right to nominate or present a candidate to a vacant benefice. A distinction was made between ecclesiastical, lay, and mixed patronage. See Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* Part II, Bk. I, chaps. 29–34.

[104] *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* (1790), p. 117. We do not understand how Mathiez, who paid his respects to Martineau's sincerity (*Rome et le clergé,* p. 155), can hold that Martineau was a philosopher (in the sense of the eighteenth century), and by no means a Jansenist (*ibid.,* p. 92).

As a consequence of these principles, in which parliamentary Gallicanism and Jansenism were so well combined, namely, that the civil lawmaker has the right to regulate the external discipline of the Church and that he has the duty to do so by a return to the primitive Church, Martineau, entering into the details of the reform to be made, reduced them to three chief heads: 1. ecclesiastical titles, offices, and functions which should be preserved or suppressed; 2. the way to provide for the offices and functions that may be judged proper to keep or to reestablish; 3. the salary that should be paid to the ministers of religion.

On the first of these topics, the report lays down the following rules: 1. that the civil power has the right to suppress, by its own authority, whatever ecclesiastical office it judges useless;[106] 2. that the only useful functions are external functions whose object is the instruction of the people and the administration of spiritual aid. "Every other function," said Martineau, "is a parasitic function, an abuse in the order of nature and of religion. We must promptly extirpate it."[107]

Hence he proposed not only the suppression of the simple benefices,[108] which he called benefices without duties and offices without functions, but also the suppression of all the canonical prebends and even of chapters, whose members have "no function but to recite prayers either in public or in private."

---

[105] *Ibid.*

[106] Martineau, *Rapport fait à l'Assemblée nationale au nom du Comité ecclésiastique sur la Constitution du clergé,* p. 17.

[107] *Ibid.,* p. 8.

[108] *Ibid.* A simple benefice was one in which the holder of the benefice did not have the care of souls or the obligation of going to choir. Such were the priors and abbots *in commendam,* and chaplains whose only obligation was the celebration of a few Masses, which they could have said by others. A double benefice was one that had some administration attached to it.

Thus, he said, we would return "to the uniform discipline of the Church in the days of its glory." The aged or infirm curés "will be given, at the expense of the nation, a substitute that, while solacing their burden, will not break their earlier habits but will permit them to remain in the midst of their flock. . . . What more delightful retirement than that of this good curé, this aged man, who has been made still more venerable by his long services! His age and infirmities do not let him fly to his parishioners, but they will be able to come to him."

By such utopias and idyllic fancies Martineau settled the first question. Then he introduced the second: how to provide for the functions preserved or restored. An abstract principle and a pretended return to the primitive Church would supply the answer. Said Martineau in his report: "Whoever must be obeyed by all must be chosen by all." Thus, he declared, the Church of the first centuries understood it. "No one was then raised to the episcopacy, no one was even advanced to the order of priesthood, except by the votes of the people. Our *Pontificales* even yet contain traces of that practice. A bishop never confers sacred orders until he has asked the approval of the people."

Concerning the support needed by the ministers of worship, Martineau declared his confidence in the nation, saying that it would fulfill candidly and loyally the duties incumbent on it toward those who, "engaged in maintaining peace in the families, no longer have time to be occupied with the question of means to provide for their subsistence. The nation would assure what is necessary for a frugal and temperate man." [109]

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy

Nothing was better calculated to win the hearts of that time than such abstractions and such appeals to a vague tender-ness. On May 29, the day fixed for the general discussion of the project, the case for the ecclesiastical committee seemed to everyone something won.

---

[109] For all the details here enumerated, see Martineau, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–18.

Treilhard was insolent. In a speech, interrupted again and again by applause, he declared: "When a sovereign believes that a reform is necessary, nothing can stand in his way. A state can admit a religion or not admit it." Another representative, who was not a member of the committee, but was familiar with canon law, would find a way to surpass even Treilhard's insolence. This man was Armand Camus, deputy of the Third Estate of Paris. His extensive erudition had won him the position of advocate of the clergy of France.[110] He had played an important part on the day of the Tennis Court Oath and, at the time of the debate on the Declaration of the Rights of Man, he had, like Mirabeau, called for a Declaration of the Duties of Man. At the time we are speaking of, he held the office of archivist of the Assembly. "We are a National Convention," he exclaimed. "Assuredly we have the power to change the religion." He did at once add: "But we will not do so; we could not abandon it without committing a crime." [111]

The right had scarcely any illusions about the outcome of the debate. We do not see them renew, against a majority whose minds were already made up, the earnest struggle they had attempted in the debate about monastic vows. The Archbishop of Aix, who was the spokesman of the right, simply delivered a calm and noble protest:

> The Committee wishes to remind the clergy of the purity of the primitive Church. The bishops, successors of the apostles, and the

---

[110] The office of advocate of the clergy did not become an organized institution until about the end of the sixteenth century. The advocates of the clergy not only pleaded their case when as a body they were a party in litigation, but also and especially upon request they gave counsel to all ecclesiastics and holders of benefices. Ordinarily these advocates met at the house of the senior among them. During the assemblies of the clergy, the place was the Grands-Augustins. On the advocates of the clergy, see L. Serbat, *Les assemblées du clergé de France,* p. 188.

[111] *Moniteur* (June 2, 1790), p. 622.

> pastors charged with preaching the gospel, are not the ones who can reject this truth. But, since the Committee reminds us of our duty, it will permit us to remind it of our rights and of the sacred principles of the ecclesiastical power. . . . Christ gave His mission to the apostles and their successors for the salvation of the faithful. He entrusted this mission neither to the magistrates nor to the king. We are in this matter concerned with an order of things in which the magistrates and the kings have the duty of obedience.

At these words, as the *Moniteur* notes, murmurs were heard. The prelate continued: "I ought to point out that the question is one of purely spiritual jurisdiction. Abuses have crept in. This I do not pretend to deny. I grieve over these as others do. . . . Retrenchments can be made in the Church. But the Church must be consulted. To deprive her of her administration would be to lay sacrilegious hands upon her." A curé of Roanne, Father Goulard, made the closing remark of Archbishop de Boisgelin more precise by saying: "If the Assembly wishes to follow up the project, it should ask the King to send it to the Supreme Pontiff with a request for him to examine it. This method is the only means of avoiding a schism." Unfortunately Goulard afterward expressed adherence to the doctrines of Camus.

Whereas the leading defenders of the project based their case mostly on the principles of Gallicanism and Jansenism, a lawyer of Arras, whose name would later become sadly famous, in his plea for passage of the law invoked the theories of the *Contrat social*. This man was Robespierre. Starting from the principle that the priests are merely government officers, with no reason for existence except their social usefulness, he deduced logically, not merely that they depended completely on the civil authority, but also "that they should be joined to that society by all the bonds which[112] . . ." At these words he was interrupted by loud objections. The Assembly understood that he was about to ask for the marriage of priests. The Jansenist austerity was startled. The authors of the project desired to pose as defenders of the purest Catholicism. At the very time the committee was elaborating its project, a strange thing happened. On April 12, 1790, the deputy Dom Gerle—the former prior of the Carthusian monastery of Pont-Sainte-Marie, who sat on the extreme left wearing the habit of his order and who soon became involved in the foolish enterprises of a visionary, Catherine Théot—suddenly proposed to the Assembly that it declare Catholicism the religion of the state. Thereupon those very deputies who, on February 15, had contemptuously rejected an identical proposal made by the Bishop of Nancy, all rose up to acclaim the proposal, now being put forward by a monk-philosopher. If the president had not hesitated for a moment to put the question to a vote, if he had not given the Assembly time to recover its calm, the measure would have been passed unanimously.

---

[112] For these various speeches, see *Moniteur* (May 30 and June 1, 1790), pp. 610–18.

Final Appeal

The general debate came to a close on May 31. Before passing to the discussion of the articles, the authorized leaders of the clergy, whose spirit of moderation did not falter for an instant, made a final appeal to the wisdom of the Assembly. Bishop de Bonal of Clermont repeated a proposal already made by Archbishop de Boisgelin during the general debate. He asked, as a preliminary condition for any deliberation on the subject, that a national council be convoked. The holy Archbishop du Lau of Arles gave his support to this proposal. Father Guégan, a priest of Brittany and rector of Pontivy, offered a measure drawn up in the same spirit. He asked that "the King should be petitioned to take all steps judged necessary and conformable to the holy canons and the liberties of the Gallican

Church to assure the full and entire execution of the present decree."[113] Both formulas offered a terrain acceptable to the Catholics, even those most prejudiced with Jansenist or Gallican ideas. According to a statement of Durand de Maillane, the committee decided to advise the adoption of this proposal.[114] But Camus' intervention turned the Assembly from this path. Using the subtle argumentation of a lawyer experienced in juridical discussion and making use of the undeniable canonical erudition which the exercise of his office had given him, the former advocate of the clergy tried to show that the spiritual authority had no place in the present discussion. Citing the Gospel, the Council of Trent, and the Pontificale, he maintained that ordination itself confers on priests and bishops the power to exercise their office anywhere in the world. Of course, he added, for the sake of good order the jurisdiction of both bishops and priests should be limited to a determined territory; but who is competent to make this delimitation? The Church, which has no territory will not do it but the state, which alone has competence and authority in this matter. Hence the whole jurisdictional organization of the Church practically comes within the competence of the state.[115]

The members of the clergy may have thought that, in the eyes of a prejudiced assembly, considerable difficulty would be experienced in refuting the sophisms of the clever canonist.[116] Perhaps they judged any opposition futile. At any rate, once again the skill of these lay jurists, whom the Church had allowed to inject themselves into the handling of her affairs, turned against the Church. The Assembly rejected, even in the moderate form in which they were proposed, the projects of De Bonal and De Guégan, which would have safeguarded the essential rights of spiritual authority. Then, as he had foreseen, the Bishop of Clermont, followed by a certain number of those who usually voted with him, declared that he would no longer take part in the deliberations of an assembly that he considered radically incompetent.[117] From that moment the discussion was speedy and almost without interest.

---

[113] *Moniteur* (June 2, 1790), p. 622.

[114] Durand de Maillane, *Histoire apologétique du Comité ecclésiastique,* p. 79.

[115] *Moniteur, loc. cit.*

[116] An experienced canonist would have found in Suarez, Thomassin, and Bossuet the means of peremptorily refuting this fundamental sophism of Camus. In the beginning the Church did indeed ordain priests and bishops without other limits of jurisdiction than those of the peoples they converted. But, subsequently, she was obliged to limit that jurisdiction. And then she herself assumed the right to regulate this jurisdiction. See Suarez, *De legibus,* Bk. IV, chap. 42, no. 11, and Bk. VIII, no. 8; Thomassin, *Anc. et nouv. discip.,* Part II, Bk. I, chap. 42, no. 8; Bossuet, *Variations,* Bk. VII, nos. 42 ff.; Brugère, *De ecclesia Christi,* pp. 81, 219–22.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy

The Civil Constitution was passed on July 12, 1790. Its aim was clear: to constitute a national Church in France. The chief provisions of the Civil Constitution had for their purpose to regulate the relations of this national Church with the pope, the civil authority, and the people.

As regards the relations of the Church with the pope, article 4 of Title I "forbade every church and parish of France, as well as every French citizen, to acknowledge in any case and under any pretext the authority of an ordinary bishop or metropolitan whose see should be established by designation of a foreign power." The allusion to the Supreme Pontiff was evident. Lanjuinais, whenever he was addressing the Assembly from the tribune, affected always to speak of "the bishop of Rome." Camus had said: "What is the pope? He is a bishop like the others. . . . The time has come for the Church of France to be freed from this servitude." Moreover, article 19 of Title II was explicit, declaring that the bishop-elect "must not address himself to the pope to obtain any confirmation, but should write to him as to the visible head of the universal Church, in testimony of the unity of faith and of the communion that he should maintain with him."

---

[117] Archbishop de Boisgelin of Aix did not imitate the Bishop of Clermont. Though not taking an active part in the deliberations, he followed them closely, still counting on the eventuality of some arrangement.

The relations with the civil government, on the contrary, were most exactly determined. Article 1 of Title I established that "each diocese would have the same limits as the department." Article 17 of Title II indicated, in case of disagreement between a bishop and his metropolitan about canonical institution, as final recourse "the appeal against an abuse of power." A decree of November 15, 1790, specified that this appeal would be taken before the civil court of the district, which would pass judgment on it as the court of last resort. Articles 2 and 3 of Title III decided that the bishops and the curés are not allowed to be absent from their place of residence longer than fifteen days without permission of the directory of their department or of their district.

Lastly, the Constitution determined the relations of the bishops and the curés with the people, by regulating (articles 1, 2, and 3 of Title II) that both bishops and curés would be chosen by election, in the same forms as the deputies and other officials, according to the decree of December 22, 1789. Abbé Gregoire in vain asked that non-Catholics should not be included in the number of the electors. But the Assembly decided that it had no need to debate the amendment of Abbé Gregoire.[118]

Two of the articles of this famous Constitution became, for a large number of priests, an occasion of deep anxiety of conscience: these were articles 21 and 38, referring to the oath. But for a better appreciation of these anxieties, we must examine, in chronological order, the succession of decrees issued on this subject by the Constituent Assembly.

On February 4, 1790, the Assembly, taking advantage of a visit by the King, who had just promised to favor the new order of things with all his power, had at once voted, in a movement of enthusiasm, a form of oath which each of the representatives, as his name was called, took solemnly in the tribune: "I swear to be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the king, and with all my power to maintain the Constitution decreed by the National Assembly and accepted by the King." [119] A few deputies who were absent or who withdrew at the moment of the taking of the oath, declared a few days later that they reserved the right to examine and to endeavor to modify a Constitution that was not yet completed and that contained several provisions which seemed to them to be regrettable. Notwithstanding the murmurs of a certain number, the Assembly accepted these reservations as something implied in the principle of "freedom of writing" and in the right inherent in the nation to revise the Constitution that it gave itself.[120]

---

[118] *Moniteur,* June 10, 1790, p. 658.

Article 21 and article 38 of Title II of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy obliged bishops-elect and curés-elect, before entering upon their office, to take the oath prescribed by the decree of February 4. On July 9, during the preparations for the great feast of the Federation that was to take place five days later at the Field of Mars, the deputy Target returned to the question and proposed that before the altars on July 14 the King, the Assembly, and the whole nation should renew the oath of loyalty to the Constitution, according to the formula passed on February 4. Bishop de Bonal of Clermont then spoke:

> Permit me to make a remark. In some matters honor and religion do not leave the slightest doubt. We are about to renew the oath of loyalty to the nation, to the law, and to the king. What Frenchman, what Christian, would hesitate to participate in a movement of pa-

---

[119] *Moniteur,* February 6, 1790, p. 150.

[120] *Ibid.,* February 8, 1790, p. 157; Picot, *Mémoires,* V, 405.

> triotic enthusiasm? . . . But, while recalling what I owe to Caesar, I cannot forget what I owe to God. In this matter any dissimulation would be a crime. I except from my oath whatever concerns spiritual things. This exception, which my conscience exacts of me, ought to prove to you the loyalty with which I shall carry out all the other parts of my oath.

The Assembly, after hearing this declaration, adopted without change the project that had been presented to it.[121]

Three months later (November 27) the deputy Voidel had them extend the obligation of the oath to all the clergy of the realm, under pain of being deprived of their office, of losing their rights of citizens, and, in case of meddling in their functions, of being prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace.[122] Some disagreements then appeared among the clergy. The consciences of several revolted. In spite of its general terms, the oath seemed to have the Civil Constitution in mind. Only one authority could solve the distressing question, the authority of the Supreme Pontiff; but the Pope had not yet issued any firm and public judgment on the religious situation of France. On March 29, 1790, in an allocution delivered in secret consistory, he had, so it was reported, deplored the French laws that had ended in the spoliation of Church property, in the suppression of monasteries, and in the ruin of public worship. Then, recalling Isaias' self-reproach, "Woe is me, because I have held my peace" (Isa. 6:5), he added: "To whom should I address my words? To the bishops, who are deprived of all authority? To the clergy, who are dispersed and humbled? To the Most Christian King, from whom authority has been taken?"[123] But this allocution was never officially published. Many persons were unaware of it or questioned its authenticity.

---

[121] *Moniteur,* July 11, 1790, p. 788.

[122] *Ibid.,* November 28, 1790, p. 1378.

[123] Hulot, *Collection des Brefs de Pie VI,* p. 1. This allocution was not published in the Roman *Bullarium.* The chief extracts from it will be found in Picot, *op. cit.,* V, 421 f.

Pope Pius VI in this address gave some of the reasons that had thus far imposed silence on him. To better grasp and judge his attitude, we must cast a rapid glance over Europe.

Foreign Views of the Revolution

When the members of the Constituent Assembly had set forth the principles of the Revolution, they had not pretended to legislate merely for Frenchmen, but for all men. The most eloquent witness of the period, André Chénier, wrote as follows: "The Revolution which has taken place among us is, so to speak, big with the destinies of the world." [124]

In this sense, indeed, the peoples and rulers had accepted the taking of the Bastille and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The former of these events was everywhere considered the symbol of the fall of the ancient regime.[125]

Johannes von Müller, the historian of Switzerland, regarded this victory of the people as "the most beautiful day that has been seen since the fall of the Roman Empire." Some German thinkers, upon reading the Declaration of the Rights of Man, thought they perceived the realization of the abstract ideal which they were pursuing in the footsteps of Puffendorf and Wolf. . . . Kant admired it as the triumph of Reason.[126]

In the palaces of St. Petersburg and Moscow they amused themselves in talking about the abuses of the feudal regime and the virtues of liberty. "True, indeed, the tone changed as soon as the thoroughly democratic character of the Revolution became manifest to these gentlemen." [127] In northern Italy some poets (Pietro Verri and Pindemonte) sang of the coming of a new era.[128] At Vienna, where the reforms of Joseph II had undermined the ancient regime, the first events of the French Revolution aroused excitement in all minds. The streets, as also the churches, were filled with handbills on which was written: "Here as at Paris." [129]

---

[124] André Chénier, *Œuvres en prose,* 1872; *Avis aux Français,* August 28, 1890.

[125] A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* II, 10.

[126] *Ibid.,* p. 11.

[127] *Ibid.,* p. 16. Cf. Pingaud, *Les Français en Russie,* p. 165.

[128] Franchetti, *Storia d'Italia,* chap. 2: *Primi effetti della Rivoluzione francese,* p. 48.

Let us note that, although the principles proclaimed in the Constituent Assembly stirred the enthusiasm of the populace, the weaknesses and the errors of the politicians who were directing France aroused the contempt of the governments. The minister of the United States in France, Gouverneur Morris, in the early days of the Assembly announced the utter failure of the French Revolution.[130] Baron de Staël, minister of the king of Sweden, Mercy, ambassador of Austria, and Florida Blanca, minister of Spain, all clearly declared they foresaw the ruin of France. As Hertzberg wrote to the King of Prussia, "the prestige of royalty is annihilated in France." Catherine of Russia did not refrain from denouncing the National Assembly, calling it a hydra with twelve hundred heads. Emperor Joseph II, brother of Marie Antoinette, declared that he could no longer draw from the Kingdom of France either men or money. In short, the European governments saw nothing but the total eclipse of the French power in the world; and, according as they were hostile or friendly to France, they condemned the Revolution or rejoiced over it.[131]

What was the Pope's impression? Pius VI, at first glance, undoubtedly did not see the real import of the events that were taking place in France. In this respect he was like most men of his time. But the common father of the faithful shared neither the enthusiastic optimism of the people with regard to the first manifestations of the Revolution nor the contemptuous pessimism of the statesmen regarding the government of France. As he had done in the affairs of Russia, Austria, and

---

[129] Sorel, *op. cit.*, II, 20.

[130] G. Morris, *Memorial and Correspondence.* See especially the notes written on July 1, 1789, and January 24, 1790.

[131] A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution,* II, 22.

Tuscany, he temporized; more than in Joseph II, in Leopold, or in Catherine II, he had confidence in Louis XVI. If the future deceived him, the blame can be laid to lack of perspicacity, a too naive kindness of heart, or the fatal nature of the circumstances. But we have no right to see in his attitude the calculations of a selfish and low policy.[132]

Pius VI's Inaction

Can we endorse the view of one historian, who says that the mind of Pius VI was not suited to comprehend the Revolution?[133] But what should we understand by "The Revolution"? Does it mean the totality of that historic event, "perhaps the most complex that ever occurred"?[134] Who at that time understood it in this sense? Does the expression mean the philosophical spirit which inspired the Declaration of the Rights of Man? Pius VI had pointed to it and described it in the first of his encyclicals, with wonderful exactness; or does it mean the Jansenist and Gallican spirit, which dictated the Civil Constitution of the Clergy? The Pope in his disputes with Emperor Joseph II and Leopold of Tuscany had sufficient experience to make him acquainted with the proceedings of that spirit.

In 1789 Pius VI, abandoned or threatened by all the Catholic powers, had no longer any hope except in France and its King.

---

[132] According to Mathiez, Pius VI's condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was a question of temporal interest. The Avignon affair decided the whole thing. He says: "The Pope saw himself threatened at the same time as pontiff by the Constituent Assembly and as chief of State by his temporal subjects. If the pontiff yielded at first, the chief of State did not hesitate . . . heeding only his pride of sovereign and his liberty. . . . The reasons of his policy are explained easily enough. He waits . . . because he does not wish to sacrifice his temporal interests to his spiritual interests. . . . His calculation proved false, his delay was to no purpose. He compromised only his own interests, and he threw France into schism and civil war." A. Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé sous la Constituante,* pp. 62, 300.

[133] L. Madelin, "Pie VI et la première coalition," *Revue historique,* LXXXI, vi.

[134] This is the expression of Albert Vandal, quoted and made his own by Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. vi.

If France alarmed him by its philosophers, it reassured him by its traditions of native generosity, and especially by its sovereign, so pious and of such pure morals. One day the Pope, speaking to Cardinal Bernis, said: "My entire hope rests on His Majesty's love for religion, on his attachment to the Holy See, and on his wise policy." Would Louis XVI, whose conciliatory character and kindness were not unlike those of Pius VI, consent to enter upon the way opened by his brothers-in-law, the Emperor of Germany and the Grand Duke of Tuscany? This hypothesis seemed unlikely. Therefore the policy of the Holy See would remain most benevolent toward the King of France. The National Assembly was indeed much agitated, and its power over the sovereign was great; but, so far as Rome was concerned, any sharpness of language would be avoided, any words that might provoke a formally schismatic declaration. They would await the inevitable appeasement. "How much I would lose," said the Pope to Bernis, "if I should lose the support of France!"[135]

On the side of Pius VI everything seemed combined to sustain his optimism. The French ambassador, Cardinal Bernis, so it seems, could, by his numerous relations with Paris, have kept the Pope informed about the events that were taking place. But the people at Paris who could have kept Bernis posted, did not do so, either because they feared the tampering with the mail or because they hesitated to disturb the quiet of the aged ambassador. Thus they failed to acquaint him with these affairs of the gravest significance.[136] Montmorin, the minister of foreign affairs, a grand seigneur and philosopher, a shifty politician, and a skeptical spirit, whose whole ambition was to maintain himself in power,[137] was careful not to have Bernis informed of the course of religious affairs in France. In fact,

---

[135] P. de la Gorce, *Hist. rel. de la Révol.*, I, 371.

[136] Masson, *Bernis*, p. 450.

[137] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

Bernis was kept quite out of touch with events.[138] If by chance he asked a precise question, he was answered with words like these: "Our internal difficulties are not of a sort that are viewed from outside. In a very short time they will be calmed." [139] On other occasions, by way of reply, he was presented with a stupid comparison between the pope and the sultan.[140] Bernis, whose frivolous youth was spent amid philosophers and courtiers,[141] and who in his wise old age returned to the traditional beliefs and the old fidelities, was not at times without the sad presentiment of a great catastrophe. He wrote on December 5, 1785: "I am old and I should like to end my life without being a witness of the Revolution that threatens the clergy and religion itself." [142] But Montmorin took such pains to lull the old cardinal's vigilance and, at need, to distort the events that a sense of security prevailed in Bernis' mind. Moreover, everything was so calm in the Eternal City, where, as dean of the diplomatic corps, surrounded with honors and respect, he was fond of hearing himself called "the second personage of Rome." In that capital of the Christian world the feasts were still so beautiful! The magnificence of the public worship hid the decadence of the faith.[143]

Besides Bernis, whose diplomatic office did not permit him to tell everything to the Pope, the Holy See had at Paris a nuncio, Dugnani, and an auditor, Quarantotti. But "evidently they were lacking in sharpness, for they did not warn the Secretary of State that affairs were taking a turn quite different from that which they had expected. Their dispatches were most precisely drawn up when they concerned simple facts; but the

---

[138] Masson, *loc. cit.*

[139] *Ibid.*, p. 451.

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 450.

[141] Bernis' worldly youth is well known. On his close relations with Voltaire and his important part in the suppression of the Jesuits, see Masson, *Le Cardinal de Bernis,* and Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi,* Vol. VIII.

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 452.

[143] P. de La Gorce, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

Secretary of State was quite uninformed about the new ideas." [144]

Such being the condition of affairs, the report of the first outrages committed by the French Revolution against the Church reached Rome only as an echo, softened and, as it were, muffled. Furthermore, in reply to the apprehensions which Pius VI had expressed to Louis XVI, the King wrote a letter full of the most religious veneration, saying that he would be watchful, with the attention of a Christian and of an elder son of the Church, to prevent any injury being inflicted upon the religion of his fathers, the union with the Roman Church, and the respect due to the ministers of religion.[145] The Pope then charged Bernis with the duty of thanking the King "for his edifying and gracious letter and of expressing the Pope's heartfelt and most sincere gratitude." [146] The abrupt suppression of the annates, decreed in spite of the Concordat of 1516, keenly pained the Supreme Pontiff; but, Montmorin having assured him that the measure had been decided on only by urgent financial necessities and that it left intact the respect due to the solemn treaties and the rights of the Holy See, the Pope condescendingly informed the French court that "his heart was always disposed, in the presence of these cruel circumstances, to grant as a favor, in particular cases, the suppression of the payment of the annates." [147]

A short time afterwards the decree that placed "the possessions of the clergy at the disposal of the nation" revived the Pontiff's alarms. But the astute Montmorin hastened to make known to the Pope that the question was not definitively terminated, that some expedients would be able to conciliate everything.[148] The fact that the ministry included Champion de Cicé, archbishop of Bordeaux, and especially Le Franc de Pompignan, former archbishop of Vienne,[149] reassured the Pope. Could the devout and courageous prelate, who had so vigorously unmasked the philosophers, give his approval to the maneuvers of the enemies of the Church? The Pontiff's anxiety was the more easily calmed since he now had at his side, as chief minister, in place of Cardinal Buoncompagni, the peaceful Cardinal Zelada, an old man of seventy-two, "a friend of repose, an enemy of rigorous measures, and altogether devoted to France." [150]

---

[144] Pisani, *op. cit.*, p. 167. Cf. Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires de France,* I, 264, and Gobbio, *La Chiesa e lo stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione.* 1905, p. 73.

[145] *Archiv. Vat., carte sciolte,* quoted by Gendry, II, 112.

[146] Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé,* p. 42.

[147] On the conciliatory attitude of the Pope in the affair of the annates, see Masson, *Bernis*, pp. 460–65.

The suppression of monastic vows, news of which reached Rome at the beginning of March, 1790, was a most cruel blow for the heart of Pius VI. Montmorin, fearing an outburst, went to see the nuncio. He urged Bernis to obtain the Pope's silence. But certain influences were being exercised in the opposite direction. Several persons of the French court who had been driven from Versailles by the events had emigrated to Rome. There they even formed a sort of elegant and polite society, in which the most conspicuous personages were the Polignacs, the Vaudreuils, and the Choiseuls; the heart of this group was Cardinal Bernis' palace.[151]

From this circle came the most urgent suggestions to persuade the Pope to condemn the new government of France. Pius VI hesitated. He had begun working on an encyclical when the intervention of Bernis, ambassador of France, and of Azara, minister of Spain, prompted him once again to delay. He was afraid that a public manifestation on his part might precipitate events by way of a violent persecution. He felt that he would satisfy his duty of conscience by protesting against the new law in a secret consistory. No word of the allocution was to be transmitted to the chanceries, which would thus be supposed to be entirely ignorant of it. The Pope's protest took place on March 29. In it the Pontiff condemned in energetic terms, not only the law suppressing monastic vows, but also the abolition of the tithes, the nationalization of Church property, and the admission of non-Catholics to all civil offices. The French government took every possible precaution to keep this document from receiving any publicity.

---

[148] P. de la Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 272.

[149] Pompignan had resigned his office of archbishop upon entering into the ministry, August 4, 1789. See Bouvier, *Le Franc de Pompignan*, p. 88.

[150] P. de la Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 278.

[151] Masson, *op. cit.*, pp. 468–70.

However, as Montmorin wrote, a moment came when every clever attempt failed.[152] "If the Church of France," wrote Bernis, "continues to be treated so harshly, I cannot answer for the patience of the head of the Catholic Church." [153]

The Pope and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the event that obliged the Pope to make a solemn pronouncement on the religious affairs of France.

Articles 21 and 38 of Title II of this law obliged bishops and priests to take an oath of loyalty to the Constitution. Hence arose distress of conscience for a large number of the clergy, for they were not certain whether this oath had in view the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. If such was, in fact, the case, was the Constitution manifestly schismatical?

Today we answer "yes" without hesitation. But the fact was less clear to the faithful and the priests who asked themselves these questions in 1790. Had not the Assembly recognized that a person could take the oath to a Constitution while retaining the right to examine it and to oppose it by legal methods? [154] Had not the Assembly accepted the reservation made in open session by the Bishop of Clermont, with regard to the spiritual power of the Church?[155] Was the Civil Constitution of the Clergy incurably bad? Abbé Barruel wrote in his *Journal ecclésiastique:* "I was the first to remark how various articles . . . could become legitimate by the approbation of the Holy See and of the bishops."[156] Moreover, the proposed Constitution contained a final article as follows: "The king will be begged to take all measures judged necessary to carry out the full and entire execution of the present decree." Was this statement not an indication that the King would receive a commission to negotiate with Pius VI? Furthermore, this last article had indeed not been submitted to the vote of the Assembly; but the reason for this suppression was well known. Treilhard explained it in the tribune: following some disturbances in Avignon, the relations between Rome and Versailles had become so strained that the two courts were no longer able to treat freely with each other. Meanwhile the word was circulated that Rome was disposed to enter upon a negotiation.[157] Thirty bishops, deputies in the National Assembly, published an *Exposition des principes sur la Constitution du clergé,* which was drawn up by Boisgelin. This statement, in beautiful and firm language, pointed out four points of the Civil Constitution sharply opposed to the canon law: 1. the suppression of fifty-one episcopal sees; 2. the election of bishops and curés by electoral colleges open to non-Catholics; 3. the granting to metropolitans the canonical institution of bishops; 4. the suppression of the relations of obedience with the pope. But this document itself, which was signed by all the bishops of France except four,[158] expressly recognized that the schism was not yet accomplished, and that negotiation with the pope could still remedy everything. The bishops said: "We wish to avoid a schism. Why has the Assembly not declared the incompetence of the authority to which we appeal? . . . Because the Assembly has the feeling of the rights of the Church, although it does not mention the Church. Its silence is the avowal of the justice and of the necessity of our demands." [159]

---

[152] *Ibid.*, p. 478.

[153] P. de La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 276.

[154] See *supra*, p. 123.

---

[155] *Ibid.*

[156] *Journal ecclésiastique,* December, 1790.

[157] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 163.

[158] Brienne of Sens, Talleyrand of Autun, Jarente of Orléans, and Savine of Viviers.

Of course the Jansenists advanced arguments more decisive in their eyes. We read in the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques:*

> You say that the Constitution is in opposition to the Council of Trent. But this Council has not been received in France; and the secular authority that rejected it, against the wish of the bishops, was indeed less legitimate than the authority which today opposes it in a number of provisions. Yet all the French monarchs who have died since the Council of Trent have died in the peace and communion of the Church. In vain does anyone allege that the new Constitution contains some abuses. It does not contain so many as the Constitution under which we were living.[160]

Yet the Pope, always ill informed about the character of Louis XVI, and sincerely believing that this prince would never sanction the Constitution so long as it had not been submitted to the Holy See, had abstained from intervening officially that he might leave the freedom of initiative to the French government. The Pope merely wrote to the King [161] and to the two archbishops who were members of the council of ministers (Champion de Cicé and Le Franc de Pompignan), counting on them to prevent the promulgation of the decree. The former archbishop of Vienne did not attend the meetings of the Council on August 24, 1790, when the King of France decided, with death in his soul, to approve the Civil Constitution;[162] but the Archbishop of Bordeaux had the lamentable courage to overcome the King's hesitation. If the sincere repentance of Champion de Cicé has won his pardon before God, history has only one word to characterize his act: treason.

---

[159] *Exposition des principes,* p. 12. Cf. Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 34.

[160] *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques,* February 1, 1791, p. 19. This number of the *Nouvelles* is devoted almost entirely to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. We scarcely need to note the difference between the attitude of the kings of France and that of the Constituent Assembly. These kings had delayed making the decrees of Trent laws of the state; the Assembly made laws of the state containing provisions contrary to the Council.

[161] Roskovany, *Monumenta,* I, 434.

The deed was done. In spite of the Pope's brief *Intimo ingemiscimus corde,*[163] which implored the King to exercise invincible opposition to the law, the weak Louis XVI went to the very limit in yielding. In December, 1790, he confirmed the decree which imposed on the bishops and curés the obligation of taking the oath to the Constitution, under pain of being deprived of office.[164]

---

[162] Abbé Barruel, in his *Journal ecclésiastique* of February, 1791, p. 280, then in his *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* p. 58, sharply attacked the memory of Le Franc de Pompignan, whom he charged as follows: 1. with being associated (August 24) with Cicé's steps to induce the King to approve the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; 2. with having kept secret the letter which the Pope had written him on July 10 and which clearly disapproved the Civil Constitution. Feller, in his *Biographie universelle,* art. Pompignan; Guillon, in the *Collection des Brefs du Saint-Siège,* I, 38; Royou, in the journal, *L'Ami du Roi,* and some others repeat the same charges. But Emery, in his note inserted at the beginning of the works of Le Franc de Pompignan (ed. Migne, I, 15), refutes Barruel's accusations, saying that Barruel was ill informed. With regard to the supposed part taken by the Archbishop of Vienne at the Council meeting of August 24, the library of St. Sulpice (Emery documents) contains testimony which seems to us conclusive. Abbé Pichot, who belonged to the clergy of St. Sulpice in 1790 and who died as canon of Lyons in 1814, wrote to Father Emery (March 8, 1802): "No one can charge Pompignan with having cooperated in the Civil Constitution of the clergy, since he was not at the Council meeting. In fact, he fell ill on August 17, 1790, and left his apartment only to be carried to the grave. But the approval did not take place until August 24. I call Saint-Priest, Minister of the Interior, to bear witness to this fact. That same day he came to Pompignan to inform him of what had taken place. I myself witnessed the tears shed by both of them. The next day certain business brought me to the Marchioness de Gramont. As I concluded this matter of business with her, three bishops entered (of Bourges, of Dijon, and of Castres). The Marchioness asked them news of the Assembly. They replied that at the King's Council the members had taken advantage of the illness of the Archbishop of Vienne so as to have the Constitution approved and that they were persuaded it would not have taken place if the Archbishop had been present. They had the King's explicit promise to this effect." As to the Pope's letter not being made known, the Archbishop of Vienne should not be held responsible. The letter, by its very nature, was a document not intended for publication. Says Father Emery: "Three or four days after the death of the Archbishop of Vienne, when the brief was found among his papers and was communicated to the most zealous bishops of the Assembly, such as the Bishop of Clermont, these judged, in accordance with the tenor of the letter, that its publication would be imprudent." Migne, I, 16. We can, moreover, note this by the text of the letter, published by Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de France,* I, 9. Cf. C. Bouvier, *Le Franc de Pompignan,* pp. 89–101.

[163] September 22, 1790. Roskovany, I, 437.

This decree opens a new phase. By the laws referring to the goods of the clergy, and to monastic vows, and by the Civil Constitution of July 12, 1790, the Church had been stripped of her patrimony and the most essential of her rights. The decree of November 27 inaugurated a new era of persecution.

---

[164] This act of Louis XVI was his first juridical act of cooperation in the Civil Constitution. To speak of a *sanction* given to this law by Louis XVI is incorrect. According to the principles laid down on October 1, 1789, the Constitutional laws had no need of the royal sanction. Yet the *approbation* given by the King on August 24 was a pledge of his cooperation for the application of the law.

CHAPTER V

The Persecution (1790–99)

In the words of a certain historian devoted to the revolutionary ideas, "The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the chief error of the Revolution." [1] The philosophers had fancied a "citizen-clergy," [2] as they said, professing the faith of the Savoy vicar; the Gallicans had dreamed of a Church subordinate to the state; the Jensenists, of a return to the purity of morals of the first centuries. Never were expectations more brutally contradicted by the facts. A few months after the promulgation of the celebrated Constitution, the majority of Catholic France, taking their stand about the Pope, cursed the Revolution. The clergy faithful to the Church were forced to refuse their obedience to the state, and the clergy loyal to the Constitution, who were often centers of intrigues, ambitions, and greed, were far from recalling the austere virtues of the primitive Church. The consequences of the Civil Constitution would extend farther: the exiles and massacres, and the civil and foreign wars, which desolated France during the last years of the eighteenth century, were, as the subsequent pages of this history will show, connected with that important act of the Constituent Assembly.[3]

---

[1] Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat, de 1789 à 1870,* p. 68.

[2] *Adresse de l'Assemblée au peuple français,* drawn up by Talleyrand, February 11, 1790.

[3] Cf. Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française* (7th ed.), II, 115. "The scaffolds of the Terror are to be found in germ in the decrees of 1790." Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VI, 18.

The Taking of the Oath by the Clergy

The days that followed the promulgation of the law seemed to justify its authors. About half of the parish clergy, which was a third of the secular clergy, considered as a whole, took the required oath.[4] Most of the jurors (those taking the oath) retracted later on; but at the outset only one expert canonist saw the schismatical depth of the Constitution, only one experienced statesman foresaw the remote consequences of it. Let us imagine the country pastor, confronted by an oath of obedience to the laws, which had been passed by the assembly of the people's representatives and which had been approved by the Most Christian King. Such a pastor is under the necessity of taking this oath under penalty of abandoning his church, his rectory, his flock, and even of being prosecuted as a disturber of the public peace. In many parishes the good curé did not hesitate; he took the oath without any qualms of conscience. His error was the more excusable since, by various reports, he was able to know that, even after the passage of the law, negotiations were being carried on between the court of Rome and that of France. He was, indeed, well aware that the dependence of the clergy on the civil power was not something new in the land of France.

Most assuredly the bishops and even the Pope were exceedingly slow in giving up hope of an understanding[5] with the French government. Louis XVI, in his somewhat misty policy, had made known that his acceptance of the law was in a way conditional and that he would wait for the Pontiff to regularize, by a brief, the provisions of the law which were not in accord with the common law of the Church.[6] And, after all, everyone saw especially in the new law, the abolition of a worn-out regime which had too long weighed on all. Lastly, with that optimism in the future which then filled all men's souls, many better-minded people persisted in counting on the goodness of men and on the providence of God, to smooth out the difficulties that still remained to be resolved.

---

[4] Such are the results of the labors of Sagnac, "Essai statistique sur le clergé constitutionnel et le clergé refractaire," in the *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* November, 1906, pp. 97–115, and of Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* I, 184–89.

[5] See Bridier, *Mémoires inédits de M. de Salamon, internonce à Paris de 1790 à 1802,* documents, no. 6. Pius VI in his correspondence often alludes to these delays and to the astonishment they must cause. Cf. Theiner, *Documents,* I, 15, 34, 76.

Little by little we see these illusions disappear. Soon the game of Montmorin, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, became evident: to play both the Pope and the King. The negotiations begun were continued in useless parleys. Evidently the Assembly had decided to apply the law in its full scope, whatever might be the reply of the Holy See. The French ambassador at Rome, Cardinal Bernis, was instructed to notify Pius VI that the new conversations did not have in mind an examination of the Constitution, far less its amendment, but simply its application. Before applying the law, they did not even wait for the Pope's reply. Upon the death of the Bishop of Quimper on September 30, the president of the ecclesiastical committee, Abbé Expilly, was elected in his place as bishop of Finistère, according to the form established by the Constitution.[7] At the same time Archbishop Loménie de Brienne of Sens organized the episcopal council according to the new regulations. Public opinion was not deceived about the personal dispositions of such prelates; according to Mirabeau's expression, it regarded them merely as "officials of morality." Addressing the bishops on November 20, Prudhomme wrote the following in his journal: "Gentlemen, no other restraint is needed than that of a national code." [8] Thereafter one of the most obsessing passions of the members of the Constituent Assembly was evidently the anti-religious passion.[9]

---

[6] See the letter of Louis XVI, under date of September 6, 1790. (*Archives des affaires étrangères, corresp. de Rome,* reg. 913.)

[7] Four hundred electors met at the cathedral and, on the third ballot, Abbé Expilly was elected by 233 votes. On November 23 Montmorin wrote to Bernis: "We think that His Holiness should be able to find some means of validating the election of Quimper. . . . Having emerged from this series of difficulties, we would seek some suitable solutions whenever new difficulties come up." Expilly's election took place on October 31. [Quimper had been the episcopal see in the department of Finistère—Tr.]

The Pope, however, continued to preserve silence. This silence lasted until March 13, 1791. Faithful to the policy he had followed with regard to Joseph II, Catherine II, and Leopold of Tuscany, the Holy Father did not wish to destroy anything. His desire was to make every effort to avoid a schism. Pius VI would be the last to cling to belief in Louis XVI's energy. Perhaps he also feared—and he would have had good reasons for doing so—that a considerable number of bishops, still influenced by their desire of reconciliation, and a large number of priests, still too ignorant of the real situation, would not heed the counsels of a wise intransigeance.[10] Later on, when the Pope found himself in the presence of precise facts, testifying to the schismatical and revolutionary nature of the law, he made the voice of his authority heard with mighty force; and the events showed that his prudence was sound: the large majority of the priests obeyed him without hesitation, resisting the persecutors with a heroism worthy of the early centuries.

Aim of the Assembly

The events following one another from the end of November, 1790, to the beginning of March, 1791, show that the enthronement of Expilly at Quimper and the new regulations issued at Sens by Loménie de Brienne were not isolated instances, but belonged to a plan systematically conceived and methodically pursued. The manifest design of the fanatics who dominated the Assembly was to apply the Constitution as promptly as possible, in the most brutal manner, and without regard for the authority of the pope.

---

[8] *Les Révolutions de Paris,* VI, 303 (November 13-20, 1790). Expilly, consecrated on February 24 next, conformable to the rubrics of the *Pontificale,* by Talleyrand, was a true bishop. See, in the *Vie de M. Emery* (I, 256), the precautions which the superior of St. Sulpice took to assure himself of the validity of this consecration. Therefore no one has ever seriously denied the episcopal character of the constitutional prelates and the validity of the ordinations which they subsequently performed.

[9] Sorel, *op. cit.,* II, 115.

[10] In his dispatch of August 18, 1790, Bernis wrote to Montmorin: "The royal sanction takes from the Pope many of the means which he would have been able to

On November 5 the deputy Duquesnoy, one of the men devoted to Montmorin's policy, speaking from the rostrum, said: "You have published a decree on the Constitution of the Clergy. The Assembly should know that it is being carried out. . . . I ask that, within two weeks, the ecclesiastical committee make a report on the execution of the decrees relative to the Constitution of the Clergy." Lanjuinais, speaking in the name of the committee, made a reply by adducing the election of Abbé Expilly, which had just taken place in the city of Quimper, and by announcing that preparations were made in the other departments.[11] This promise was not long in being carried out.

The first victims of the law were the canons. Undoubtedly it was thought that this procedure would stir less feeling among the faithful. The possessions of the chapters were inventoried, and the members of the chapter were forbidden henceforth to meet together. The chapter of Montpellier had already been suppressed (October 16). The suppression of the chapter of Bourges took place on January 11, 1791; that of Saint-Pons on February 8. The same measures soon occurred at Mirepoix, Tréguier, Saint-Omer, and generally in the provinces.

In certain old cities, where the cathedral or collegiate church was the traditional center of religious celebrations, this first outrage was grievously felt. At Noyon, at Saint-Omer, at Agde,

---

employ usefully. In fact, he said to me: 'Any papal decision in the midst of the troubles with which France is agitated may become infinitely dangerous and may lead, by the division of the parties, to schism and fatal decisions that we wish to avoid.' "

[11] *Moniteur,* November 6, 1790, p. 1282.

at Tréguier, and at Saint-Pol-de-Léon the impression was very deep.

> When the church bells ceased to announce the daily psalmodies; when the silver lamp, burning night and day before the altar, had been taken down; when, in the streets overgrown with moss, people's steps were more rare; when the people saw the little ribbon of the seals come loose from the entrance of the chapter hall, from the sacristry door, from the choir grilles, they understood that the same Revolution as wiped out so many ancient traces would leave deserted the places where all that life had developed. The bishop's palace, disappearing with the chapter, would complete the decadence.[12]

In more than one place the beginning of a resistance occurred. At Laon the people demanded and obtained the reopening of the cathedral; at Cambrai a tumultuous crowd forced the withdrawal of the commissioners who came to affix the seals.[13]

A certain number of bishops (e.g., those of Mirepoix, Verdun, Soissons, and La Rochelle) published official protests.[14] The local authorities then had the protests seized and denounced the prelates to the Constituent Assembly. Some department directories, those of the Jura and the Corrèze, suppressed the salaries of the rebellious bishops. The directory of the Haute-Marne, by its own authority, closed the cathedral of Langres. These measures gradually became general, while the audacity of the fanatics increased daily. Prudhomme in his diary wrote: "Woe to the prelates who persist in keeping some relics of the old regime! They will merely hasten the Revolution that is preparing in the realm of religious ideas." [15] No illusion was any longer possible. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was regarded by the anticlericals as a minimum, an insufficient minimum, a makeshift. The Constitutional leaders demanded the marriage of priests, the suppression of the episcopacy, the removal of the barrier separating the clerics from the laity, and so on.[16]

---

[12] P. de La Gorce, I, 313.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 314.

[14] See the list of these protests in a report by Voidel, *Moniteur*, November 28, 1790, pp. 1370–72.

[15] *Les Révolutions de Paris*, VI, 303.

In the Assembly the deputies of the left finally cast off the mask. Henceforth there was no question of respecting the authority of the Holy See or the regulations of ecclesiastical law. Voidel (November 26) declared: "You invoke the canonical forms. Who can be unaware that these canonical forms were, in the hands of the despots and of their base courtiers, a poisoned weapon with which they increase or perpetuate their abuses?" After Abbé Maury had spoken about the pope, the Jansenist Camus said: "The pope holds a position of authority; but he has not the right to give orders to the bishops."[17] Following this discussion, the Assembly (November 27, 1790) decided that within eight days from the publication of the present decree all the bishops and curés should take the oath on Sunday at the close of the Mass and in the presence of the municipal authorities. Failure to comply with this order would deprive them of their office and of their rights as French citizens. Furthermore, if thereafter the bishops and curés should exercise their ministry, they would be prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace. This same penalty was imposed on all persons who "should combine or conspire to arouse opposition to the decrees of the Assembly."[18]

After such declarations and such a vote, Rome could not think of carrying on effective negotiations with France. Every hope of agreement was finally lost. The law of November 27, according to the expression of a contemporary, Montlosier, "had destroyed all the bridges." But this declaration of war, by enlightening the Catholics, awakened their sluggish courage. In the Assembly the left could not restrain an emotion when

---

[16] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

[17] *Moniteur*, November 29, 1790, p. 1378.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 1372.

Maury addressed these words to them. "Take care: it is not good to make martyrs." [19]

Louis XVI and Pius VI

The law did indeed still lack an element essential for its being put into execution; namely, the King's sanction. But that sanction was not doubtful to anyone's mind. Louis XVI made one last effort to obtain from the Pope a reply that would rescue his conscience from remorse. On December 3 he wrote to Pius VI, begging him to approve the new division of the metropolitan sees and of the bishoprics, such as the Constitution had established. In this letter the King wrote: "Your Holiness' silence or refusal will most certainly bring on a schism. . . . I implore Your Holiness to give me the promptest and most satisfactory reply." [20] The Pope, relying on the movement of opinion that was forming in France, on the 14th replied to Bernis, that, by approving the Civil Constitution of the Clergy he would incur the disapprobation, not only of the universal Church, but also of the Gallican Church. All he could do was to defer his decision.

But in France events happened with precipitation. The local authorities continued to fill the episcopal sees according to the new regulations. A bishop was elected in the Ardennes on November 23; another, in Mayenne on December 12. On the 20th of December the Assembly called on the King to sanction its decree. Louis XVI experienced hours of frightful anguish. He turned to Boisgelin. This prelate, who soon would refuse courageously to take the oath, was touched with pity. He tried to calm the King's conscience, saying to him that from the moment his acceptance was and appeared to be indeed a forced acceptance, he could rest with a calm conscience. An old friend of the King, Saint-Priest, the former intransigeant minister, had the same pity for the poor monarch. Neither had the courage to urge Louis XVI to a resistance which they felt was beyond his strength.[21]

---

[19] *Moniteur,* November 29, 1790, p. 1378.

[20] *Archives des affaires étrangères,* quoted by Masson, *Bernis,* p. 489.

On the 26th, with broken heart, the King gave the required sanction. His message was received in the Assembly with applause which, according to the diary of Camille Desmoulins, continued ten minutes.[22] The left acclaimed, as someone has said, not the King, but its own victory.[23]

"I should prefer to be king of Metz," Louis XVI said when signing the decree, "than remain king of France in a situation like this; but it will end soon." [24] He was thinking of the help he hoped for from Europe.

On November 26, the day before the passing of the decree, which now seemed to him inevitable, he wrote to Breteuil, asking him to open negotiations with the friendly courts. He said: "I approve whatever you do to attain the end I have in mind, which is the re-establishment of my lawful authority and the happiness of my people." [25] What the King was thinking of, however, was not a foreign invasion, but a display of force at the frontiers, where the Emperor would mass troops, thus showing that "he regarded as evil the way they were treating the King." [26] The powers did not lend themselves to this chimerical project. No doubt, the situation of Europe with regard to the religious questions was no longer the same as ten years earlier. The time had passed when the Bourbon courts agreed together to wrench from the Holy See the suppression of the Society of Jesus. The King of Naples was reconciled with Rome; the Emperor showed himself full of regard for the Supreme Pontiff; the ambassador of Spain, Florida Blanca, put in touch with the emissaries of the Count of Artois, seemed to be more and more unfavorable to the anti-Roman policy which he had formerly championed; at Rome, at Brussels, at Turin, and at Coblenz the French *émigrés* stirred themselves, demanding, if not a serious invasion, as the Count of Artois desired, at least the military display desired by Louis XVI. Some have supposed that Pius VI himself favored, in some way, an intervention of the powers,[27] or at least let himself be influenced by a diplomatic movement in this direction. These guesses, which rest on no historic document, seem to be belied by the very character of the Pontiff.[28] If any power ever tried to ally its cause to that of Pius VI, the action was taken only when the powers' interests were at stake. Thus, as Albert Sorel remarks, the Europe of 1790 was incapable of risking itself for the cause of the kings, still less for the cause of the Church. Christendom no longer was, and, strictly speaking, Europe no longer existed. Nor did the question of right any longer exist; might held the first place. The states, moreover, appeared not more alarmed by the French Revolution than they were scandalized by it. They viewed the Revolution as "a revolt that weakened a country they feared: France. They did not at all foresee the power of expansion which the French movement would take. . . . When, two years later, Europe decided to march against the Revolution, the movement was not prompted by a monarchical solidarity (even less to defend the cause of the Church), but in the hope of finding, this side of the Rhine, another Poland to dismember." [29]

---

[21] Documents found in the Tuileries, third collection, no. 175.

[22] *Révolutions de France et de Brabant,* no. 57.

[23] De La Gorce, I, 346.

[24] Marquis de Bouille, *Souvenirs,* I, 185.

[25] Flammermont, *Négociations secrètes de Louis XVI et du baron de Breteuil* (1885), p. 8. Madelin wrote: "Let us not condemn this step too quickly. The appeal to the foreigner, which appears odious to us today, was traditional. . . . Coligny, the League, and the great Condé had provided examples of it. Moreover, we should not consider abnormal the fact that Louis XVI had with the cabinets relations quite different from those which the diplomatic corps engaged in. At Versailles a Secret of the King always existed. Louis XVI should surprise us only by his prolonged scruples." Madelin, *La Révolution* (1911), p. 156.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 157.

---

[27] The nuncio Dugnani wrote to the Secretary of State as follows: "In the cafes and public squares people speak more than ever of Rome. They say that the Pope is stirring the courts of Europe to send troops against France, and other like calumnies. I believe that the enraged people of Avignon and our other capital enemies are spreading these rumors and are trying to have the reports accepted, rumors tending to exasperate the population and to make them regard the Holy Father as the chief enemy of the Constitution." *Archives vaticanes*, August 23, 1790, quoted by Gendry, *op. cit.*, II, 130.

[28] Mathiez, who credited a movement attempted in this sense, adds: "Yet it is not likely that this diplomatic action, which a person surmises rather than knows, had carried great weight in Pius VI's decision." Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

The Pope, then, could count neither on the King of France nor on Europe to sustain him in his campaign against the schismatical undertakings of the Assembly. But, more and more attentively and hopefully, he followed the movement of protest which became more pronounced in the clergy and the people. On October 23, 1790, he had sent a brief of praise to the abbess of Remiremont, Adelaide de Bourbon-Condé, who had just protested against the decrees of the Assembly, and on November 11 he wrote to the Bishop of Basel, preoccupied with the question of his see, that, as pope, he would never confide the flock of that bishop to other hands, and that any newcomer would, in his eyes, be an intruder.[30]

Two new facts, throwing still more light on the growing hostility of the Assembly and on the increasing fidelity of the French episcopate, finally moved the Pope to issue a definitive and solemn condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. These facts were first the ensemble of the measures taken by the French government in the affair of Avignon, and secondly the courage which the French clergy showed when they were called upon to take the oath.

The Avignon Affair

Among the territories belonging to the Holy See, Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin enjoyed a particular status. Acquired at different periods,[31] they had kept their old franchises and paid only light taxes, the revenue of which, devoted to the local government, did not come to the Holy Father.[32] These possessions of the Holy See, being enclaves in France, had several times served as pledges to the kings of France when these latter wished to exert pressure on the papal government. Twice, at the conflict over the regalia and at the time of the affair of the franchises, Louis XIV had seized Avignon and the Comtat. From 1768 to 1774 Louis XV, to force the pope to suppress the Jesuits, had repeated the same outrage. The Revolution, on this point as on so many others, continued and aggravated the aggressive measures of the ancient regime.

---

[29] Madelin, *La Révolution*, p. 136.

[30] Gendry, *op. cit.*, II, 131.

From the outset of the Revolution, the enemies of the Holy See employed the tactics of spreading the new ideas in the very states of the Holy Father. Camus, who as a member of the assembly played a preponderant part in the discussion of the Civil Constitution, carried on a steady correspondence, from the first months of 1789, with one of the leaders of the Avignon movement, a man named Raphael. Circumstances favored these undertakings. The economic crisis that afflicted France during the winter of 1788 had been particularly terrible in Avignon and in the Comtat Venaissin. In the month of March some uprisings, provoked by the forced unemployment of workers and by the general wretchedness, broke out here and there. The vice-legate, Casoni, had food distributed gratis to the poor, opened for the unemployed workshops of charity, and organized patriotic subscriptions.[33] Pius VI himself furnished an expedition of wheat, and sent to the disaffected places a commissioner instructed to receive the complaints and to remedy the abuses that might have been introduced. At the same time he exhorted the people to beware of the snares that were laid for them.[34] But, as at Paris, the word "hoarder," cleverly disseminated in the populace, stirred excitement in their minds. Notwithstanding all the contrary appearances, the ringleaders made the vice-legate responsible for all the calamities. The news of the taking of the Bastille fired men's minds. "Citizen militias" were formed to put down the so-called oppressors of the people. At the instigation of some foreigners, who settled in Avignon and at Carpentras following the French occupations, and of some people of the district, captivated by the current ideas, a new party was formed, which took the name of the party of "patriots." The party grew by the accession of all the malcontents, found its officers and its means of action in the militias, which the overwhelmed vice-legate had to legalize, and soon believed itself in a position to talk big and to demand reforms.

---

[31] The Comtat Venaissin had been given to the Holy See by St. Louis in 1228; Avignon had been ceded to the Holy See by Queen Joanna of Naples in 1348.

[32] On the historic origin of the papal sovereignty in Avignon, on the political regime in vigor there, and on the maneuvers by which the revolutionary party attempted to arouse the country against the pope, see the discourse delivered in the Assembly by Abbé Maury. Maury, a native of the Comtat, set forth the situation with particular competence. See especially his *Seconde opinion sur la souveraineté d'Avignon*. Maury, *Œuvres choisies,* V, 237 ff.

The decrees passed by the Constituent Assembly in the night of August 4, wrote Raphael to Camus, "fired all heads; and each one in this little state desired to procure the same advantages as those provided for all Frenchmen to enjoy. They propose your decrees for their regular model." [35]

A certain Raphael, "a dangerous man, as clever at intrigue as he was crafty and deeply wicked," [36] was appointed first consul of Carpentras. At his side was a philosopher, Baron de

---

[33] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[34] Picot, *Mémoires*, VI, 141.

[35] Quoted by Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[36] Passeri, *Mémoires sur la révolution d'Avignon et du Comtat Venaissin* (1793), I, 56. The reader should not confuse this Raphael of Carpentras with Raphael of Avignon, of whom we shall have occasion to speak presently.

Sainte-Croix. This latter was an enthusiastic man of letters, who had made a deep study of the political institutions of antiquity and who dreamed of transforming his little country on the model of ancient Greece.[37]

Whereas Raphael and Sainte-Croix merely sought to introduce independent institutions, the Avignon agitators demanded union with France. "A former schoolteacher who had become a journalist (Sabin Tournal), a notary (Lescuyer), lawyers (Peyre and Palun), innkeepers (Molin and Peytavin), a butcher (Chaussi), had behind them the laborers, accustomed to follow readily the direction of those who gave them work, and the peasants, who desired the suppression of the feudal rights and the tolls." [38] To be relieved of the burdens of the papal regime without being subjected to those of the French regime was the ideal which the leaders flashed before the eyes of the peasants of Avignon and of the Comtat Venaissin. In the *Annales du comtat Venaissin* we read: "In spite of the shallow sarcasms, we shall have peace, and the French laws, and we shall not have any taxes." [39] Now Pius VI did not at all oppose wise reforms. He instituted an assembly of notables whose task would be precisely to point out to him the abuses to be corrected. But Raphael and his followers wished themselves to make the reforms.[40] The peasants rose up and, as we are told by a contemporary, insurrections became a sort of fashion. One day the people of Caumont forced the monks of the Carthusian monastery of Bompas to cede part of their property to the municipality; another day the people of Bédarrides divided among them the possessions of the archbishop of Avignon. Cavaillon, Bollène, and Avignon instituted "patriotic" (that is, revolutionary) municipalities. On June 11, 1790, the districts of Avignon voted the union of their city to France, "as the sole means of withdrawing from the vengeance of the court of Rome, from the nobles, and from the aristocrats."[41] At the same time they drove out the vice-legate, who retired to Carpentras, the capital of the Comtat.

---

[37] Baron de Saint-Croix was a member of the Academy des inscriptions.

[38] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[39] Antonelle, the mayor of Arles, denounced this false expectation in his pamphlet, *Quelques réflexions sur la pétition du peuple avignonnais.*

[40] Passeri, *op. cit.*, I, 64.

The people of the Comtat did not associate themselves with the demand of the people of Avignon; Raphael and Sainte-Croix continued their dream of an independent republic. At Carpentras a representative assembly was formed, which eagerly adopted the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the main articles of the French Constitution. Then, as the Pope refused to approve the decrees of the Assembly, it ignored him, declared its decisions executory, expelled the vice-legate, who withdrew to Savoy, and placed the executive power in the hands of three chiefs of the party of patriots. Thus was completed the rupture with the Holy See. The Pope attempted the use of mild measures, offering amnesty to the disturbers. But the leaders of the revolution haughtily refused the papal pardon.

However, the petition of the Avignon districts reached the Constituent Assembly, which (November 20) decided to send a corps of troops to Avignon. These troops were charged with maintaining order there, "in concert with the municipal officers," that is, with the insurrectionary movement.[42] This step, an open attack on the sovereignty of the Holy See, was an armed introduction of the principles of the Revolution into the States of the Church. Ten days later, under the protection of the French soldiers, the Avignon municipality ordered Archbishop Giovio of Avignon, who had retired to Villeneuve, and all the priests, to take the civil oath under pain of being deprived of their offices. This imposition of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in the domain of the Holy See was the final outrage, which the Pope's patience no longer had a right to tolerate. The hour for denouncing the schismatical Constitution had struck.

---

[41] *Ibid.*, I, 210.

[42] In the Assembly the debate on this question was most excited. The speech of Maury, who took up the defense of the pope, was broken by interruptions of the left. Robespierre was solemn and tragic. He exclaimed: "We have been told that Avignon was the property of the pope. Good heavens! The people, property of a man! From the very tribune of the National Assembly this blasphemy has been uttered." "At these words," says the *Moniteur*, "the Assembly applauded again and again" (November 20, 1790). For the exigencies of the case, this contention was distortion of the claims of the Supreme Pontiff, the principles of international law, and the facts themselves. Pisani rightly says: "Pius VI could not at the very first blow consent to let himself be stripped of Avignon and the Comtat. The papal temporal power was not like the absolute power of hereditary princes. The oath which he took at his consecration obliged him to keep intact the patrimony which he was to administer. Thus he was not free to alienate Avignon; his resistance was dictated to him by a higher duty. Moreover, the welfare of the people of Avignon did not call for their union with

Abbé Grégoire

While these events were happening at Avignon and in the Comtat, the attitude of some of the French people changed. A division gradually took place in France among the people and the clergy, between the men who until then had adhered to the same formulas with quite different intentions. Those whose minds inclined toward philosophism or were won over to Jansenism showed themselves ready to obey the decrees of the Assembly and to take the oath; but most of those who had attempted merely to realize a political and social reform in a Christian spirit had decided to refuse the oath energetically and to take an open stand against the Revolution.

Conspicuous in the former group was a man of marked personality. Throughout the course of the Revolution and for the defense of the worst of causes, this man continued to employ a talent of the first order and a rare energy. His name was Abbé Grégoire, curé of Ambermenil. Along with Bishop de La Fare

---

the French monarchy. . . . So true is this fact that the large majority of the people of Avignon and of the Comtat did not ask for a union with France. On the contrary, they openly opposed the move of the "patriots." Pisani in *Revue des questions historiques,* October 1, 1911, p. 528.

of Nancy, he represented in the Assembly the clergy of Lorraine.

Abbé Grégoire was ardent for the Revolution to the point of fanaticism, devoid of the eminent gifts that make a philosopher, a statesman, or an orator, and was often subject to mistakes of judgment and to impulses. He was, nevertheless, desirous of preserving the Christian faith, thoroughly penetrated with his priestly duties, encompassed by the esteem which attached to his uprightness, courage, and regular life, and he did not approve the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; but, satisfied that the dogma of the Church would remain intact, he judged that the safest step to take was submission.[43] On December 27, the very day following that on which the King gave his sanction to the decree of November 27, Grégoire mounted the rostrum to take the civil oath.

He began by protesting his inviolable attachment to religion and the country. He said:

> Of that religion we shall be constantly the missioners; if need be, we shall be martyrs for it. . . . But, after the most mature and serious examination, we declare that we perceive nothing in the Constitution which can harm the holy truths which we must believe and teach. . . . No consideration, therefore, can defer the pronouncing of our oath. . . .
>
> I swear to watch with care over the faithful entrusted to my guidance; I swear to be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the king; I swear to maintain to the full extent of my power the French Constitution, and notably the decrees relative to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

After him fifty-one ecclesiastics took the same oath. The next day (December 28) and the following Sunday (January 2, 1791) two prelates (Talleyrand, bishop of Autun, and Gobel, bishop of Lydda *in partibus,* coadjutor of the Bishop of Basel) went through the same legal formality. Talleyrand did so without comment, like a man eager to finish an irksome and unpleasant task, with that mysterious smile in which could be read the cold skepticism of the man for whom political success was almost all that counted, for whom conviction weighed but little. Gobel pronounced his oath with hesitation and embarrassment, encompassing his oath with prolix restrictions and speaking in a tone that seemed to retract these very restrictions.

---

[43] De La Gorce, *op. cit.,* I, 351.

Bishops Boisgelin and Bonal

Two days later, the time for the taking of the oath expired. All who had been enlightened by the recent events regarding the intentions of the revolutionary party or who were confirmed in their opposition always regarded as their chiefs the Archbishop of Aix (Boisgelin) and the Bishop of Clermont (Bonal). Both of these men had wished first to exhaust the attempts at conciliation. On December 1 Archbishop de Boisgelin had written to the King, offering him the resignation of the entire episcopate if such a resignation would promote the establishing of peace; he also proposed to the King to intervene with the Pope to obtain authorization for the re-election of the bishops and a general delegation to the metropolitans giving them, in the name of the Holy See, the right of canonical institution of their suffragans.[44] On January 2, 1791, Bishop de Bonal proposed to the Assembly a formula of the oath which explicitly excepted "the objects that depend essentially on the spiritual authority." [45] But Boisgelin's proposals did not result in anything, and Bonal's motion merely provoked threats and hoots: the office of the Assembly refused to receive it.[46] Evidently the session of January 4 would be decisive. The men of the Revolution knew that a large number of the clergy had decided to refuse the oath. Therefore pressure was brought to bear on them. The preceding day pamphlets were circulated; cries of death were uttered. Well before the session the galleries were filled with rowdies and disturbers, with habitués of the clubs, who resolved to exercise intimidation on the representatives.

---

[44] *Ami de la religion,* XIII, 165.

[45] Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 52.

[46] *Mercure de France,* January 8, 1791.

The day of signing arrived. After a preliminary debate about the meaning and consequences of the oath, during which Grégoire, Mirabeau, and Barnave spoke in succession, the president proceeded to call by name those expected to take the oath. The first one called was Bishop de Bonnac of Agen. He spoke amid an impressive silence. "I abandon my office," he said, "without regret, as likewise my fortune; but I should feel regret at the loss of your esteem. I beg you, then, to accept the avowal of the pain I experience in being unable to take the oath." A simple priest, Abbé Fournetz, curé of Puymarac, in the same diocese of Agen, followed him: "You wish to recall the first ages of the Church. With the simplicity of the first Christians, I will tell you that I glory in following my bishop, as Lawrence followed his pastor." Leclerc, curé of La Combe near Alençon, began thus: "I am a son of the Catholic Church." But clamorous shouts interrupted him. This series of refusals made the Assembly impatient.

The roll call was suspended. The president [47] declared, again and again, as though to urge the priests to take the oath pure and simple, that the Assembly did not intend to touch spiritual matters. "Let the Assembly embody this declaration in a decree," exclaimed Cazalès. But Mirabeau remarked that "perhaps the dissidents called spiritual what the Assembly called temporal," for example, "the demarkation of the dioceses." Cazalès' motion was rejected. A few ecclesiastics took the oath, but with reservations about spiritual matters; others, with references to the declarations of the Assembly. Four took the oath pure and simple. At about five o'clock the president, addressing the Assembly, said: "For the last time, I invite the ecclesiastics present to take the oath." No one rose up. In short, as we read in a journal of the time, the effect of this session was the contrary of what the majority had hoped. Out of forty-four bishops or archbishops, only two (Talleyrand and Gobel) had defected. Of the simple priests, two-thirds courageously refused the oath. As the Bishop of Uzès wrote the next day. "This day has honored religion, and we have retired, proud of our glorious poverty." [48]

---

[47] This was Emmery. He belonged to the religion of Israel.

The Papal Condemnation

News of the memorable session of January 4, 1791, brought great comfort to the Holy Father. Thenceforth he was assured that the French episcopate, enlightened on its duties, would not make a schism. The moment seemed at hand to make public the condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, on which Pius VI had been working for some time. This solemn condemnation would, however, not appear until two months later; but the Pontiff now profited by every occasion to manifest his sentiment. Thus, when Cardinal Loménie de Brienne informed him by letter (January 30) of his taking the oath, the Pope replied by a severe brief, threatening to deprive him of his cardinalitial dignity unless he retracted immediately.[49] On February 9 Pius VI wrote to the Bishop of Toulon to encourage him in his resistance. Lastly, by two briefs (March 10, 1791,[50] and April 13) [51] he formally condemned the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

[48] Letter of Bishop de Béthisy of Uzès, January 5, 1791, read at the session of the Assembly, February 22, 1791.

[49] Brienne did not wait for the effect of the Pope's threat. He resigned from his cardinalitial office; and this former minister of Louis XVI passed over to Jacobinism.

[50] Brief *Quod aliquantum;* Guillon, *Brefs des Instructions de Pie VI* (1798), I, 104–262.

[51] Brief *Charitas;* Barberi, *Bullarium,* IX, 11–18.

The first brief, addressed to the bishops who were deputies of the National Assembly, examined deeply the principles and the chief provisions of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Therein the Pope found two basic principles, which he declared equally heretical, namely: 1. that the ecclesiastical power depends on the authority of the princes; 2. that the election of the pastors of the Church belongs to the people. Replying to the objections of those who, like Grégoire, distinguished between dogma and discipline, and demanding for the latter a complete subjection to the state, the Holy Father said: "How often discipline has a close union with dogma! How often it serves to maintain the purity of dogma! Thus we see the councils pronounce anathema against those who are culpable simply of breaking the laws of discipline."

Then turning to those who had been waiting impatiently, the Pope told them that, if until then he had refrained from separating the authors of the Constitution from the Catholic unity, this delay was with a view to avoiding by patience a deplorable schism. But, after long prayer and reflection, he declared that he could not approve a law that upset all the dioceses of a great realm, adopted the error of Luther and Calvin regarding the election of pastors, gave to the civil courts the supreme jurisdiction of cases purely ecclesiastical, inflicted injury on the authority of the bishops by establishing at their side a council arbitrarily composed, and lastly debased the clergy by replacing the fixed revenues of their benefices with a money salary furnished by the state. In short, he condemned a legislation "worse than all those which princes had formerly issued."

The brief of April 13, 1791, addressed to all the faithful of France, must be regarded as one of the most solemn decisions of the Church. After recalling the reasons developed in his earlier letter, and the *Exposition des principes* which was signed by the whole episcopate of France, except four bishops, the

Supreme Pontiff added: "Now no one of the faithful can any longer doubt that this new Constitution of the Clergy is established on heretical principles and hence heretical in several parts." [52] Consequently the Holy Father expressly forbade "all those who had been irregularly elected and unlawfully consecrated, to perform any act of jurisdiction under pain of suspension and nullity." [53] Yet, wishing to employ every indulgence that he could permit himself, and hoping by this means to remedy the evil already committed and to lead his strayed sons back to the fold, the common Father of the faithful declared that for the present moment he would withhold the more severe censures prescribed by the canons. "But," he concluded, "if, which God forbid, our paternal warning produces no fruit, let all know that our intention is to launch anathema against the unsubmissive, to denounce them to the Church as schismatics, to remove them from the bosom of the Church, and to deprive them of our communion." [54]

The Constitutional Clergy

For all who had seen clearly into the policy of the Constituent Assembly, these two briefs were a solace; for most of the others, they were a light. Many priests who had taken the oath, retracted. The fear of a general apostasy, which had haunted the soul of Pius VI, was dissipated: France would not give the spectacle which, two centuries earlier, the England of Henry VIII had given, as a great nation passing into schism in the footsteps of its bishops and priests.

Yet the constitutional clergy organized themselves the more actively since they were composed, henceforth, solely of sectarians resolved to go to the very limit in the way of revolt, or of minds sincerely under illusion about their duties. After Talleyrand and Gobel, three bishops had taken the constitutional oath. These were Jarente, bishop of Orléans, whom Cheverny in his *Mémoires* calls "a sort of fool, a villainous man";[55] Savine, bishop of Viviers, a philanthropist of the school of Rousseau, who would upset his diocese by the most fantastic reforms and incoherent philanthropic fancies;[56] and Loménie de Brienne, that atheist archbishop who soon became president of the club at Sens with a liberty cap for a hat.[57] For a return to apostolic times, this ecclesiastical scandal was a poor beginning.[58]

---

[52] Barberi, *Bullarium,* IX, 13.

[53] *Ibid.,* p. 17.

[54] *Ibid.*

Archbishop Gobel

On March 13, 1791, to replace Bishop de Juigné, who had just emigrated to Savoy, an electoral assembly, consisting of 21 priests and 664 laymen, elected Gobel archbishop of Paris. The life of Jean Baptiste Gobel is perhaps the most lamentable example of the ravages that, by the seductions of a corrupt aristocracy, then by the influences of an unrestrained demagoguery, can be brought about in a soul naturally upright, but vain and weak. Born September 1, 1727, at Thann in Upper Alsace, he pursued brilliant and solid studies in theology in Rome. Soon thereafter, he won the confidence of the prince-bishop of Basel, Frohberg, who obtained him for his suffragan and consecrated him bishop of Lydda *in partibus*.

---

[55] Quoted by Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 51. Picot gives us the impression which the sight of this prelate made on him in 1789, a prelate "clothed in ermine and silk, draping himself like a woman for a theatrical performance, a court prelate, devoid of anything serious in his character." Quoted *ibid.,* p. 50.

[56] On Savine, see an excellent monograph by Simon Brugal, *Le schisme constitutionel dans l'Ardèche, La Font de Savine* (1889). Amid his strayings, Savine always preserved a depth of generosity and kindness. After his withdrawl to Paris, he had the honor of being imprisoned for seven months at the Conciergerie for having tried to save an innocent man from death. There during his imprisonment he was touched by the grace of conversion. The conversations he had in prison with a venerated priest, André Georges Brumauld de Beauregard, former superior of the students of philosophy in the St. Sulpice Seminary, opened his eyes in the matter of his straying. At the age of seventy he retired to Embrun, to his family home, and there engaged in the severest austerities. On the fact of his conversion by Beauregard, see Bertrand, *Bibliothèque sulpicienne,* III, 190.

[57] Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 154.

[58] Gobel, auxiliary of the Bishop of Basel for the French part of the diocese, was not reckoned among the prelates of the Church of France. Hence generally only four juring bishops are counted: Talleyrand, Jarente, Savine, and Loménie de Brienne. We must add two prelates not at the head of a diocese: Miraudot, bishop of Babylon, and Martial de Loménie, coadjutor of his brother in Sens.

Well educated, active, regular in his morals, irreproachable in his doctrine, the new prelate seemed at first to justify the confidence that brought him to a position of honor. But his elevation to the episcopal dignity turned his head. Sprung from plebeian stock, he was a contrast in the environment of all those bishops of the ancient regime, recruited from the highest nobility. The pomp which he thought he must indulge in led him into excessive expenses. Although pensioned by the prince-bishop and by Louis XVI, he was obliged to borrow money to meet his extravagances. His need of money and his thirst for honors soon led him to almost unbelievable depths of baseness. He intrigued to obtain the government of a diocese. He gambled; he lost foolishly large sums in brilliant company. To have himself accepted in high society, he made a show of the fashionable vices. In short, the Revolution found Jean Baptiste Gobel crushed with debts and at Paris leading the procession of the most sumptuous prelates.

Elected deputy to the States General by the bailiwick of Belfort and Huningue, he voted, until June 1, 1790, with the most intransigeant part of the clergy. Then suddenly he changed his views. The Revolution won him completely: Gobel became a revolutionary and at once went to the extreme. He joined the Jacobin club and there delivered the most hot-headed speeches. With enthusiasm he enrolled among the Assermentés and presented his candidacy for the bishoprics that would become vacant. The election (March 13) that put him at the head of the constitutional clergy of Paris intoxicated him, as had happened to him when he was chosen by the prince-bishop of Basel. On March 17, before taking possession of the church of Notre Dame, he made a tour of the city in a popular procession, composed of his electors, at the head of which marched the drummers and musicians of the National Guard.[59] This upstart Talleyrand, without complaisance and without nobility, in his last tragic moments called for the help of the Church he had denied.

Bishop Grégoire

The juring priests of Paris [60] rallied about Archbishop Gobel, but he was never the soul of the Constitutional Church. That place fell to Grégoire, bishop of Loir-et-Cher, who was imbued with adamant prejudices against the Holy See, but who had a strong and upright soul together with a consistent character. He showed as much courage in opposing the anti-Christian manifestations of the Convention and the Directory as he had shown obstinacy in defending the so-called liberties of the Gallican Church against the power of Rome.[61]

---

[59] Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopate constitutionnel,* pp. 53–59. Cf. G. Gautherot, *Gobel.*

[60] According to the most reliable calculation, the juring priests of the Paris clergy must have numbered about 800. Pisani, I, 218. Later on, many of them retracted.

[61] Henri Grégoire, born at Veho near Lunéville, on December 4, 1750, crowned at the age of twenty-three by the Academy of Nancy for his *Eloge de la poésie,* and shortly after by the Academy of Metz for his *Essai sur la régénération des Juifs,* was curé of Ambermménil when the Lorraine clergy sent him to sit in the States General. Having become the chief of the Constitutional Church, Grégoire carried on an immense correspondence with his followers, bishops, priests, and laymen. The thousands of letters received by him have been saved from destruction. Classified methodically by departments, they are today in the possession of M. Gazier, professor at the Sorbonne. (Thanks to the communication of these letters, Pisani has been able, in his *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel,* and again in his four volumes on *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* to compose the biographies of more than one prelate of that period and the history of more than one event.) Grégoire was a revolutionary, and he seldom lost an occasion of saying so; but, being a philosopher only after the manner of Voltaire, of Rousseau, and of the Encyclopedists, he was never a philosopher in the strict sense of the word. No one has more indignantly denounced

Soon, not only Loir-et-Cher, but also other departments of France had their Constitutional prelates. As at Paris, their enthronement took place amid much civil pomp. Drums were played in the fields, cannons thundered, and the National Guard formed the bishop's escort. At Le Mans, Saint-Claude, and Meaux, the municipal musicians filled the cathedral with the air of the *Ça ira.* At Laval, Grenoble, and Tulle, one of the first acts of the new bishops was to preside at a meeting of the clubs of the city.[62] These newly elected Constitutional prelates made little change in the religious ceremonies. The people maliciously remarked that these bishops did not abandon any of the luxurious adornments for which the prelates of the ancient regime had been reproached: neither the glittering ring nor the rich pectoral cross nor the rochet ornamented with fine lace. The title of Monseigneur, which became the style in the eighteenth century,[63] was pleasing to these new dignitaries of the Church; so much so that, among the ruins of so many abolished titles, this one, thanks to them, has been fixed in the usage of contemporary French.[64]

We would by no means assert that these Constitutional prelates were entirely without moral worth. One well-informed historian says:

---

the moral and religious doctrine of those men. In his *Mémoires* he wrote: "I have seen that these philosophers, ever ready with the big words 'humanity' and 'probity,' had two different doctrines, one for theory, the other for practice. Jean Jacquės produced his *Confessions* and his hypocrite the *Vicaire savoyard;* the author of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* is also that of the Pucelle; Diderot wrote impieties and an indecent romance; Wilkes and Lewis were unbelievers; Paray, in one and the same work, combined what is worst in impiety and in crime against nature." Grégoire, *Mémoires,* II, 3.

[62] P. de La Gorce, *op. cit.,* I, 410.

[63] Voltaire made fun of the recent practice of the prelates of his time, who, he said, began to "monseigneurize" themselves.

[64] But under the Consulate we see that the Constitutional bishops no longer receive the title of Monseigneur, but that of Reverendissimus. Bishop D'Orlodot of Laval thus entitles one of his charges to the clergy: Charge of the Reverendissimus bishop of Laval. Priests were then designated by the title of "venerable"; thus, the venerable Coisnard. Isidore Boullier, *Mémoires ecclésiastiques,* p. 357.

Often they have been represented as disreputable priests, the scum of the clergy, lacking both faith and morals. Such an absolute judgment would be unjust. Some Constitutional bishops were priests who never had the faith, such as Minée of Nantes or Pelletier of Anger; some were dissolute men, such as Dunouchel of Nimes and Porion of Arras;[65] some were avaricious men, such as Deville or Rodrigue:[66] but those whom a detestable and public vice rendered despicable were scarcely a dozen. We do meet with scholarly men of weak faith, like Lalande or Villar,[67] who made a career of the priesthood; revolutionary orators like Fauchet or Huguet; unscrupulous "arrivists" like Joubert or Mestadier; but of these we do not count more than ten.[68]

The rest[69] were divided into two almost equal parts. On one hand, we see sincerely pious priests, but men whose piety was sentimental and vague. These were virtuous officials, but men of poor judgment. Intoxicated by the grand words of the Revolution or seduced by the honors of the episcopate, they gladly let themselves be elected and in the episcopate continued the relatively upright lives they had formerly led. For instance, Bonnet of Chartres was a zealous bishop, charitable and pious. The influence of his surroundings had drawn him into the revolutionary party. He died in 1793, just when the persecution was about to reach even the Constitutionals.[70] Likewise Avoine of Versailles was always conscious of the dignity of the priesthood. He protested against the suppression of the church bells and was denounced to the Convention for having refused institution to a married priest. He died in the same year as Bonnet, 1793.

---

[65] See Pisani, *Répertoire biographique,* pp. 335–37. Porion, bishop of Pas-de-Calais, former curé of Saint-Nicolas, apostatized, gave up the priesthood, and married. He was succeeded in 1797 by Asselin, curé of Saint-Sépulchre at Saint-Omer, who was consecrated at Paris, October 8. Asselin used to make his journeys on an ass, to distinguish himself from the pompous bishops of the ancient regime. This patriarchal mode of travel won him the epithet of "donkey bishop." Information communicated by Canon Bled of Saint-Omer. Cf. Deramecourt, *Le clergé du diocèse d'Arras pendant la Révolution,* IV, 164–77, 200–74.

[66] Deville was bishop of the Eastern Pyrenees (diocese of Aleth); Rodrigue, of the Vendée.

[67] On Villar, see Boullier, *op. cit.,* pp. 60, 319.

[68] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 25.

[69] The number of Constitutional bishops was the same as that of the departments, eighty-three.

[70] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 70.

The second category of Constitutional prelates was that of fighting men. Examples will again clarify the point. Grégoire and Expilly (whom we have already met), Le Coz of Ille-et-Vilaine, and Lamourette of Lyons engaged in striving against the abuses of the ancient regime and of promoting the triumph of the Revolution. Lamourette was a scholarly and pious Vincentian, but a man wholly won over to the sentimentalism of the time. He was seduced by the abstract theories of the philosophers, and at an early hour he became a friend of Mirabeau. He quit his diocese, leaving the administration of it to his vicars, and took his seat in the Legislative Assembly, where he preached union and fraternity. He is famous in history for having provoked the doleful comedy that was called "the Lamourette kiss." He perished on the scaffold in 1794 after retracting his errors.[71]

Other aggressive spirits became rather defenders of Gallicanism and, to some extent, of Jansenism so far as Jansenism preached a return to the primitive Church and limited the powers of the pope.[72]

Périer of Clermont was an Oratorian, of blameless morals and of great worth in education. He was brought to the Constitutional Church by his Gallican theories, by the exaggerated notion he had of the rights of the state. Persecuted under the Terror, he withdrew to Grenoble, where he tried to assemble the Constitutional clergy. Later he returned to Clermont and there labored energetically in the organization of public worship. Appointed bishop of Avignon after the Concordat, he would show under the restoration the same servile devotion to the civil power.

---

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 377–82.

[72] Several Jansenists opposed the Civil Constitution: such were Jubineau and Maultrot. Certain others (e.g., Bishop de Noël of Lescar, the Oratorian Father Tabarand, the Dominican Father Lambert) opposed the Revolution itself. Dufraisse and Volfius, both former Jesuits, continued to be adversaries of the Jansenists, even when they became full adherents of the Revolution and entered into the Constitutional episcopate: the former as bishop of Le Cher, the latter as bishop of the Côte-d'Or. Resting his view on these facts, the Constitutional J. J. Mounier maintained that Jansenism had no influence on the Revolution. Mounier, *De l'influence attribuée aux philosophes, aux franc-maçons et aux illuminés sur la Révolution de France*, p. 63. Mounier's conclusion is not correct.

Bertier of Rodez, whose stern bearing and melancholy air always inspired the respect of those who approached him, was not only a man of duty in his private life, but also a man of combat in his public life. He had always professed a moderate Gallicanism, which he defended with grim and uncompromising firmness. He too faced persecution under the Terror. He affirmed his Catholic faith openly, but throughout his life refused to recognize in the pope any primacy other than "one of honor and of jurisdiction regulated by the canons." Such are the very words he used in his last will.[73]

Each department had its Constitutional bishop. But not each parish had its Constitutional curé. We may say that, from this point of view, France was divided into two parts. The regions where the new ideas had penetrated [74] received without ceremony and with a sort of indifference the new curé who was sent to them by order of the district, and who officiated, baptized, and administered the sacraments like his predecessors. His church, however, already not frequented, now became more and more empty according as the conscience of the faithful became enlightened. As for the religious populations of Flanders, Artois, Alsace, Rouergue, Velay, and the whole region of the northwest, they presented an altogether different spectacle, but at first everything passed in a manner equally calm. The faithful priest who had refused to take the oath sought refuge in the house of some friend. Almost everywhere he refused to use the faculty, which was granted him, to celebrate Mass in the church after the juring priest had completed his service. The faithful for the most part did not attend the church services of the new worship and gathered about the non-juring priest. On Sunday, around the barn or the chapel of the château where the faithful priest officiated, an overflowing crowd openly participated in the holy mysteries. The decrees forbidding a non-juring priest to exercise the functions of his ministry were practically regarded as null and void. For the celebration of baptisms the faithful contrived, by more or less subtle proceedings, to evade the regulations and to avoid the ministry of the priest sent by the district. For example, for funerals they left to him the removal of the body, but they did not enter the church, and afterward they asked the prayers of the non-juring priest.

---

[73] Pisani, *op. cit.*, pp. 377–82. Pisani quotes *in extenso* Bertier's curious will. Pisani's *Répertoire biographique* is the basis for all study of the Constitutional episcopate. Each item is accompanied with an abundant and reliable bibliography.

[74] Ile-de-France, Picardy, the Orléans district, Burgundy, Berry, Touraine, Provence, and the Dauphiny.

The misfortune of these faithful clergy was the departure of their bishops. Many prelates, like Bishop de Juigné, had emigrated. These men generally retained an irreproachable orthodoxy.[75] Among them were some noble and lofty-minded bishops. Several, like Aviau, returned to France at a time when the danger was still great.[76] From these bishops came the most vigorous protests against the Revolution's laws of persecution. "We may, however, believe that many of them, if they had remained in their dioceses, instead of departing to a foreign land, would have more effectively combated the Constitutional schism; and if they had lost their lives there, as did Le Lan, Le Rochefoucauld, Castellane, Sandicourt, and Breteuil, they would have better served the Church than by withdrawing from their flock and losing all contact with it. The good done by the bishops who remained at their post,[77] shows that staying in France was not impossible.[78]

---

[75] Yet we find some of these *émigré* prelates later refuse to accept the Concordat or refuse to send the pope the resignation which was asked of them.

[76] Bishop Aviau was the first bishop to return to France.

On the other hand, we cannot pronounce peremptorily on this grave question. As *émigrés,* these bishops remained in communication with their clergy by letters. Moreover, if they had remained in France, a great number of them would perhaps have been deported, thrown into old hulks, guillotined, and many dioceses would thus have lost their shepherds. Whatever the case, the curés and their faithful, under the direction of the vicars-general to whom the emigrant bishops had confided their powers of administration, continued this regime for a while in comparative tranquillity, until the day when the authorities decided to impose the juring priests by force and to drag the refractory priests off to prison.

The Legislative Assembly

The Legislative Assembly would commit this new fault. The Constituent Assembly had deliberated under the influence of the ideologists whose spirit is well summed up in the utopias of Abbé Sieyès: the Legislative Assembly would now see the reign of the Jacobins, which was personified by Danton. Says Taine:

> The Jacobin is like a shepherd who of a sudden, in a corner of his cottage, discovers some parchments that call him to the crown. . . . He fills his imagination with their contents and at once takes on the tone that belongs to his new dignity. Nothing could be haughtier or more arrogant than this tone. "Know that you are kings and more than kings," exclaimed Chalier. "Do you not feel the sovereignty circulating in your veins?" . . . The Jacobin is virtue; no one can resist him without the act being a crime. Consequently nothing is clearer

---

[77] Such as the bishops of Alaid, Bazas, Lectoure, Dijon, Mâcon, Cavaillon, St. Brieuc, St. Papoul, and Senlis.

[78] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 17. In spite of solicitations by their friends and in spite of the extreme dangers of the situation, fifteen bishops refused to abandon their dioceses.

than the object of the government: to subject the wicked to the good, or, what is simpler, to suppress the wicked; for this purpose they will employ deportation, drowning, the guillotine. The Jacobin canonizes his murderers. . . . Whoever follows logic is a fool; whoever believes in conscience is a monster.[79]

The ideologist had dreamed endlessly of the original freedom, of the perpetual equality, of the purity of the primitive Church. The Jacobin seeks to realize these dreams brutally. The fields of action on which the daring of the Jacobins would be exercised was plainly indicated: the Declaration of the Rights of Man and especially the Civil Constitution of the Clergy offered these fields to them.

The Declaration proclaimed the inalienable freedom of man. One of the first acts of the Legislative Assembly was to give freedom to the Negroes of the colonies. No thought was given to the question whether these slaves were prepared to make use of it. In fact, they were not; from the end of October, on the far shore of the Atlantic immense columns of smoke and flames suddenly shot upward; and from week to week the civil war at Santo Domingo increased, wild beasts let loose against their guardians, 50,000 Blacks on the rampage. At the very outset 1,000 persons were assassinated, 15,000 Negroes were killed, 200 sugar factories were destroyed, the damage being estimated at 600,000,000 francs; a colony which was equivalent to ten French provinces was almost wiped out.[80] In the name of liberty, the Assembly abolished the indissolubility of marriage.[81] The result of this decree was more than 20,000 cases of divorce in France in the course of the five years that followed, more than 6,000 in Paris in less than three years.

---

[79] Taine, *Les origines,* V, 34–38.

[80] *Ibid.,* V, 147.

[81] The decree of November 20, 1792, establishing divorce, began thus: "The National Assembly, considering the importance of allowing to all Frenchmen the right of divorce, resulting from individual liberty, which would be lost by an indissoluble agreement, decrees: 1. Marriage is dissolved by divorce; 2. divorce takes place by the mutual consent of the parties."

The Declaration proclaimed the perpetual equality of men. In the name of equality the Legislative Assembly suppressed all seigneurial rights that the Constituent Assembly had declared lawful,[82] and it ordered the burning in the public depositories of all genealogical titles of nobility.[83] In the name of equality some representatives of the people proposed, amid the applause of the Assembly, the equalizing of fortunes. Lamarque, in the session of June 23, declared: "The equality of rights cannot be maintained except by a continual tendency toward equalization of fortunes." "Divide the common goods," said François de Nantes, "among the citizens of the neighboring villages, in inverse ratio to their fortunes, so that he who has less patrimonial property may have the greater part in the division." [84]

The ideologists of the Constituent Assembly, in their famous Declaration of Rights, had proclaimed the sovereignty of the nation; but, for the Jacobins of the Legislative Assembly, the nation was solely the popular classes. "Only in the citizens that are contemptuously called the people," exclaimed Lamargue, "do we find pure souls, ardent souls, truly worthy of liberty." [85] Whoever has suffered from the social institutions, whether as a convict or as a bandit, belongs to the true people; and for the Jacobin the people has all rights. The Assembly rehabilitated all the deserters who had quit their standards before 1789,[86] it invited to the honors of its sessions forty Swiss of Châteauvieux taken from prison; [87] it granted amnesty to the band of condottieri of all countries and also old offenders who terrorized Avignon and the Comtat, and it allowed them to return as conquerors. Said the president Daverhoult: "Under the reign of liberty, the people has the right to claim not only subsistence but also abundance and happiness." [88] Even when the law is silent, the people can act to express its sovereign power. "Yes," declared Isnard, "the wrath of the people, like the wrath of God, is often merely the terrible supplement of the silence of the laws." [89]

---

[82] Decrees of June 18 and August 25, 1792.

[83] Decree of June 19, 1792.

[84] Quoted by Taine, *op. cit.*, V, 157.

[85] *Moniteur*, session of June 22, 1792.

[86] *Ibid.*, decree of February 8.

[87] At the club of the Girondists on April 9, the president Vergniaud welcomed and complimented these convicts.

Did the men who spoke thus see the dreadful danger of such excitations? Did they understand that the unleashing of popular fury would turn against that Church which the chief orators in the Constituent Assembly had proclaimed as having a divine character, and the later orators had solemnly declared to have spiritual independence? The fact is that their words, while stirring the anger of the people, at the same time pointed to the priest as their chief enemy. Said Isnard: "The priest is as lax as he is vindictive. . . . Send these pestiferous men to the lazaretto of Rome." [90] François de Nantes denounced the priests as being men who insinuate into the minds of children the poison of aristocracy and fanaticism.[91] The priests were referred to as the accomplices of the aristocrats and also as rebels against the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

The retractions of the juring priests became increasingly numerous. Nothing contributed more to speed this movement than such invectives, which showed the hostile character of the government and the hateful interpretation it was ready to give to the Constitution. According as the men of the Revolution, departing from vague idealism, from the dubious Christianity that had presided over its beginning, took a clearly anti-Catholic attitude, the Christianity that had been slumbering in many

[88] *Moniteur,* session of January 14, 1792.

[89] *Ibid.,* November 2, session of October 31, 1792.

[90] *Moniteur,* session of January 5, 1792.

[91] *Ibid.,* April 3, August 26, and November 13.

priestly souls of the ancient regime again recovered its strong vitality. At the same time the power, falling from Sieyès to Danton, went on declining still more, from Danton to Marat. Many a prelate, previously luxury-loving and indolent, found in his destitution the austere virtues of his state, and the faithful people gathered closer about their persecuted priests. The Supreme Pontiff, following the march of events with attention and solicitude, raised his soul to the height of the great duties imposed on him by his apostolic responsibility.

Cardinal Bernis

Among the prelates whose worldly life had dazzled the court and the city, none had been more conspicuous than Cardinal Bernis. His light verses had gone the round of the salons; his relations of friendship with Voltaire and Madame Pompadour were known to all.[92] The important diplomatic missions that had been assigned to him at Venice and at Rome, the experience of life that his great age gave him, all these had undoubtedly matured his ideas. But even at the age of seventy-six, this old man was still the great lord, living in grand style in the splendid palace he occupied at Rome. When, in the spring of 1791, the aunts of the King of France, Madame Victoire and Madame Adelaide, sought in the capital of the Christian world liberty to practice their religion, the Cardinal placed at their disposal his twelve carriages, his fifteen horses, his ten mules, and the silver service with which he was able to entertain at his table fifty persons at one time.[93] But the day when the prelate saw obviously that the government which he represented at the Holy See required of him an attitude incompatible with his religion, he resisted nobly, prepared for any sacrifice. When called upon

---

[92] Like Sieyès, Bernis had entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice and had been invited by his teachers to leave.

[93] Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 152.

(January 5, 1791) to take the oath to the Constitution, he did so with the following restriction: "Without prejudice to what I owe to God and religion." Montmorin informed him that, unless he sent a formula of oath pure and simple, the King would not be able to let him continue his diplomatic office. He replied with a formal refusal. His letter of recall was transmitted to him almost immediately.

The government, not satisfied with this deprivation, which withdrew from the Cardinal an important salary, shortly afterward refused him the allotment to which he had a right as a resigned bishop.[94] Later, when the Minister of the Interior placed him in the category of *émigrés,* his furniture was inventoried and sold.[95] A pension, which ambassador Azara obtained for him from the King of Spain, was all that kept him from the direst poverty. The noble prelate with Christian dignity endured his trials, which he had clearly foreseen upon refusing the oath pure and simple. He wrote: "I am far from regretting the loss of a fortune acquired by long and useful services. I have sacrificed all to the faith of my fathers and to the honor which they were always jealous of." [96] The historian who had before his eyes Bernis' most intimate documents and who analyzed them thoroughly has written: "As Bernis accepted ruin and almost poverty, we may be sure that he would have accepted prison and the guillotine." [97]

The Provinces

In the lower grades of the hierarchy we meet with the same examples of courage. In July, 1791, some priests of Le Finistère, rather than take the oath, let themselves be imprisoned at Brest, by order of the directory of the department. Bishop

---

[94] This allotment was due him by the terms of article 3 of the decree of July 24, 1790.

[95] Masson, *Bernis,* p. 504.

[96] Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 154.

[97] Masson, *Bernis,* p. 560.

Expilly was a member of this directory. Soon, when the directory of Maine-et-Loire arrogated to itself the same right of throwing the refractory into prison, the latter sought hiding on farms. But the soldiers of the National Guard tracked them down in their retreats and finally carried off 300 of them to the premises of the former minor seminary; there, deprived of everything, they had to undergo atrocious sufferings. Similar scenes were repeated at Laval, where several priests had sought refuge and, protected by the devotion of a deeply religious population, were celebrating Mass and administering the sacraments to the faithful in private houses. Domiciliary visits, threats, arrests, and fines failed to overcome their courage. But a decree of the directory of the department (June, 1792) had them imprisoned in the former monasteries of the Cordeliers and Capuchins; from there these valiant servants of the Church wrote to the Supreme Pontiff an address vibrant with the purest heroism.[98] At Le Mans, Nantes, and Luçon the priests opposed the chicanery of the local powers and the attacks of the clubs with the same courage. At Luçon a decree of the municipality (January 28, 1792) forbade all assemblies. The faithful did not suppose that the prohibition concerned them. The next Sunday 1,500 persons, men, women, and children, met in the public square and knelt piously while a Mass was being celebrated in the near-by chapel. Nothing less than the proclamation of martial law and the arrival of a considerable armed force was required to disperse the gathering.[99]

In several departments—Cantal, Rhône, Haute-Garonne, Basse-Pyrénées, and others—like scenes took place. Minister Roland, in a report to the Legislative Assembly (April 24, 1792), testified that neither violent expulsions nor imprisonments were able to bring the non-juring priests to submission. His conclusion was that these measures would have to be generalized and that new rigors would have to be decreed against the insubmissive ecclesiastics.[100]

---

[98] This letter, printed in Barruel's *Journal ecclésiastique* (June, 1792), undoubtedly did not reach the Holy Father. See Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 173–75, and Isidore Boullier, *Mémoires ecclésiastiques concernant le clergé de Laval,* pp. 103–5.

[99] See Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 176, who depends on a pamphlet entitled, *Exposé sincère de la situation des catholiques à Luçon.*

These rigors did but arouse new acts of heroism. The clergy now knew what position they should take regarding the wish of the Holy Father. They knew that, deeply pained by the misfortune of Bernis, Pius VI persistently declined to receive his successor, Philip de Ségur, for the simple reason that the new ambassador had taken the Constitutional oath.[101] Furthermore, the Pontiff seized every occasion to sustain the courage of the oppressed. Writing to the Bishop of Puy (January 28, 1792), he said: "I know nothing nobler and more edifying than the conduct of nearly all the bishops of France, so that we may say that the Gallican Church never shone with more radiant light."[102] On March 24 he felicitated the Bishop of Senez, imprisoned for the faith, on having suffered with constancy "the most unworthy treatment, even prison, thus following the luminous footsteps of the most illustrious confessors of the Church."[103]

New Laws of Persecution

The Assembly was eager to follow the wishes of Roland. On April 26, Anastase Torné, Constitutional bishop of Cher, whose age of sixty-five years should have preserved him from the revolutionary delirium, asked that the Assembly forbid the wearing of religious dress except within the temples, "as being an outrage against the unity of the social contract and against equality"; for, he said, "if, after the suppression of these bodies, we should see religious garbs on the streets of our cities or in the country, who would not suppose he was beholding roaming ghosts?" Two days later this same Torné, seized with a sort of rage against the religion from which he had apostatized,[104] asked that they should even "forbid all obedience to vows that had been taken." [105] On May 2 the Assembly ordered, in the name of liberty, the suppression of all the confraternities and even of all associations of piety and charity. "Thus," says an annalist reporting this decree, "conspiracy was allowed in the clubs against the safety of the state and the liberty of persons, but gathering to pray to God and to solace one's brethren was forbidden." [106] The odiousness of all these measures was now surpassed, on May 27, by the passing of a decree which condemned to deportation the non-juring priests and, as it were, making them outlaws. After a confused discussion that turned almost exclusively on the choice to be made between thirty projects more or less tyrannical, the following proposal was passed:

---

[100] *Nouveau compte-rendu au roi,* a 32-page pamphlet. *Moniteur,* April 26, 1792.

[101] On this point, see Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 155–57.

[102] *Ibid.,* II, 181.

[103] *Ibid.,* II, 182.

> The National Assembly, considering that the efforts in which the non-juring clergy are continually engaged to overthrow the Constitution, do not allow us to suppose in these clergy the willingness to join in a social pact; considering that the penal laws are without force against these men, who work on consciences to lead them astray; after declaring a state of emergency, decrees as follows: Art. III, When twenty active citizens of any one canton join together to demand the deportation of a nonjuring ecclesiastic, the directory of the department shall be obliged to pronounce the deportation if the view of the district of the department is in accord with the petition.[107]

---

[104] Torné was a former doctrinaire. On February 5, 1792, we find under the pen of Prudhomme, who was, however, an educated man, this stupidity: "Christ did not wear a religious habit. Do you want proof of it? Go and see the paintings of Jouvenet at Saint-Martin-des-Champs."

[105] Picot, *op. cit.*, VI, 183.

[106] *Ibid.*

[107] According to the law of December 22, 1789, the members of the department and district directories were chosen by election in two steps, by secret ballot and by a majority of votes. The law of June 27, 1792, was surpassed in rigor by the law of August 26 of the same year.

No voice arose, either from the benches of the Girondists, who pretended to defend against the Jacobins the cause of moderation and liberty, or from the Constitutional bishops, or from the lawyers, to protest against such a decree, which outraged both liberty and religion, which introduced anarchy in the administration of justice. A writing of Boisgelin, *Observations sur le décret de déportation,* points out what in this law rendered it incompatible with the principles of the French Constitution; the pious Archbishop de Lau of Arles published an address to the King, begging him not to sanction the decree. But Roland was insistent on obtaining the royal sanction.

We know the tragic sequence of the conflict that arose on this subject: the King's resistance, Roland's insolent letter, read in the open Assembly: "Sire, if this law is not put in force, the departments will be obliged, as they have already done, to substitute violent measures for it"; the dismissal of the factious minister; the excitation of the people, aroused by the clubs; the invasion of the Tuileries during the day of June 20; the Assembly's declaration that the country was in danger; the Assembly itself invaded by the Federates; the Brunswick manifesto heating men's heads; a new power rising up, dominating Paris and France, that of the insurrectionary Commune; the massacres of August 10; the King deprived of his functions on August 12 at the Commune, which interned him and his family in the Temple.

Execution of Priests

Such commotions could not but precipitate religious persecution. This persecution was about to have its terrible days, early in September, by the assassination of more than 1,600 victims, among whom were more than 200 priests;[108] but many a murder had preceded this great massacre.

---

[108] According to one estimate, more than 1,600 persons perished at Paris alone.

The first in date was that of Abbé Raynau, archdeacon and vicar general of Senez. Arrested at Entrevaux, near Nice, on June 6, 1792, at the very moment when he was escaping from the persecution, along with two canons of his diocese, Father Michel and Father Langin, he was showered with blows by the soldiers of the garrison, and died the same evening, after pronouncing these last words: "I pardon you all the evil you are doing me." [109] A month later, a vicar-general of Bordeaux, Jean Langoiran, and one of his companions, Louis Dupuy, beneficiary of Saint-Michel parish, were arrested by a group of armed men. The next day these priests were slain in the courtyard of the archbishop's residence, where the department administration fixed the place of its meetings.[110] On that same day a band of furious revolutionaries at Les Vans forced their way into a prison where nine refractory priests were confined. The priests were dragged to the bank of the river and, under the threat of raised swords, they were ordered to choose between the oath and death. "Death," replied a firm and solemn voice. It was that of Father Bravard, a priest of St. Sulpice, former director in the major seminary of Avignon. At this word the nine confessors of the faith fell to their knees and were horribly mutilated with blows of swords and hatchets.[111] On July 12, at Clairac in the diocese of Agen a venerable priest, Pierre de Lartigues, who generously used his large fortune in good works, was put to death by the unbridled populace after

---

Of this number, 217 were ecclesiastics, divided thus: 113 at the Carmelite monastery, 76 at St. Firmin, 24 at the Abbaye, 4 at La Force, 2 elsewhere. Lenôtre (*Massacres de septembre,* p. 283) proposes the figure of 1,614 victims.

[109] Caron, *Les confesseurs de la foi,* I, 1.

[110] On the occasion of this tragic event, Champion de Cicé, archbishop of Bordeaux, published (August 10, 1792) a touching pastoral instruction. Therein he bitterly deplores the fault he committed in affixing the royal seal to the Civil Constitution. See some passages of this instruction in Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise de France pendant la Révolution,* Vol. III.

[111] Mollier, *Saints et pieux personnages du Vivarais* (1895), p. 197; Mourret, *La vénérable Marie Rivier* (1898), p. 67.

he had suffered a long agony with wonderful patience.[112] Three days later at Marseilles, two Minims, Father Miratte and Father Tassy, were surprised in the retreat where they had sought refuge to exercise their holy ministry. They were summoned to take the Constitutional oath. Upon their refusal they were struck with the sword and then hanged to the two lamposts at the entrance of the city hall.[113] On August 4 at Manosque in the Basses-Alpes, a Franciscan, Father Ponthion, and three secular priests (Fathers Pochet, Vial, and Reyra) were dragged by the populace into an almond orchard and there were hanged on trees.[114] About the same period in Le Perche, Father Duportail de la Binardière was assassinated in the public square of Belesme by revolutionaries of the place, who wished to force him to take the oath; in Normandy, Father Guillaume de Saint-Martin was shot to death at Pont-Ecrepin by patriots who ordered him to renounce his religion and the pope.

During these times at Paris the efforts of the factions were particularly directed against the royalty, and the priests seem to have been forgotten. We have evidence of the murder of only one priest there, Father Chaudet, a former curé of Rouen. He was arrested, then released, and after a few days was assaulted in his house, thrown out of the window, and beaten to death in the street.[115] But the leaders of the Jacobin party had not disarmed against the priests. Soon scenes of murder would be multiplied in Paris, with circumstances more frightful than anywhere else.

On the evening of August 10, in that tragic session, the wretched Louis XVI might be seen attending in the reporters' lodge, to which he had taken refuge at the fall of the monarchy.

---

[112] Caron, *op. cit.*, I, 155.

[113] Picot, *Mémoires*, VI, 191.

[114] Caron, *op. cit.*, I, 25; Guillon, *op. cit.*, under the word "Pochet."

[115] Picot, *Mémoires*, VI, 192; Guillon, *op. cit.*, under the word "Chaudet."

The Legislative Assembly, under the pressure of the delegates of the Commune, passed the convoking of a National Convention and the suspension of the royal power until the Convention should pronounce upon it. By a vote of 222 out of 285, it had elected Danton as minister of justice. This choice was the crushing of the Girondist party, the complete triumph of Jacobinism.

Danton

Jacques Danton, who thus attained to the post of minister in the French government, "like a cannon ball," to use his own expression, was the son of a country attorney. The favor of the Duke of Orléans, whose agent he had perhaps been,[116] the backing of the Masonic lodges, which he had frequented at an early date,[117] and the recommendation of the most extreme clubs, where he used to make speeches, began his reputation. A real power of work, in spite of intervals of almost incredible indifference, a fierce patriotism, a strange mixture of violence and weakness, even the expression of his face, which was that of a lion and that of a bull-dog, features reflecting the brutal fire of his passions, gave this "vulgar Mirabeau," this "monster of patriotism," as he has been called, a place of his own from which he soon dominated both Vergniaud and Robespierre.

Jacobinism had found its leader; the Assembly provided him with the work for him to perform. In the session at which it elected Danton minister of justice, it declared that the decrees which had not received royal sanction would have the force of law. The principal decree that they had in mind was evidently the one aimed at the deportation of non-juring priests. The Commune of Paris, the center of the most rabid Jacobinism, which had just become aware of its might and which assumed the government of Paris, did not delay in acting.[118] On August 11 about fifty ecclesiastics, guilty of not taking the Constitutional oath, were brought before the committee of the Luxemburg section, which met in a hall of the Seminary of St. Sulpice. After a short questioning, they were taken to the former monastery of the Carmelites that would be their prison. The Carmelites themselves who lived there received orders (August 1) to disperse before October 1. The Commune advanced this date. It obliged the religious to withdraw to the inner portion of the monastery, and set apart the church and adjoining premises for the internment of the prisoners. Among the imprisoned ecclesiastics we find three bishops: Le Lau archbishop of Arles, whom we have seen taking a courageous attitude in the Assembly, and two brothers belonging to the illustrious family of the La Rochefoucauld: one was bishop of Beauvais, the other of Saintes. In the same prison was also Father Savine, superior of the seminarians of St. Sulpice, with two of his confreres.[119]

---

[116] Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

[117] *Ibid.*

Imprisonments

On August 15 further arrests were made. Armed bands invaded the Issy seminary,[120] and the near-by house that served as a place of retirement for aged and infirm priests. The invaders did not hesitate to arrest these venerable priests and lead them, with the beating of drums, escorted by the National Guard, to the church of the Carmelites. An eyewitness, Father de la Pannonie, has left us an account of the scene: "Words cannot describe the feelings we experienced at the sight of these respectable old men. Several of them could scarcely stand up. The treatment they endured during this journey made me tremble with horror. One of them especially was prevented by his infirmities from following his cruel guides with equal step; they bruised him all over by striking him with the butts of their rifles to make him walk." [121] The next day Father Gallais, a priest of St. Sulpice and superior of the seminary of the Robertines [122] and twelve of his companions were added to the number of their confreres imprisoned in the Carmelite monastery.

---

[118] The Directory of Paris, suspected of moderation, was obliged to resign on July 23. The Jacobins, whose influence was all-powerful over the forty-eight sections, brought about the decision that each section should nominate one or more commissioners to help in the government of Paris. On August 9 these commissioners formed themselves into an assembly which, under the name of the Commune of Paris, assumed a position above that of the Legislative Assembly, seized the executive power, and organized the persecution and the massacres. Marat reigned supreme in the Commune. Danton, who liked neither Marat nor the Commune, both of which were a hindrance to his power, felt himself left behind; he publicly favored the Commune and Marat, became their willing accomplice, and gloried in this association with them. Cf. Madelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 253–55, 259. On Danton, see Hilaire Belloc, *Danton*, 1928. [Tr.]

[119] Regarding Father Savine and his arrest, see Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* I, 190, 285. On the community of clerics of St. Sulpice, cf. Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* XI, 46–48.

[120] On the invasion of the Issy seminary, see Gosselin, I, 288–94.

The condition of the prisoners in the restricted quarters reserved for them was lamentable. They had to pass the first nights on the stone floor of the church. At the end of a few days mattresses were brought in. These were set down on the floor of the nave, one against the other. However, the doctors, fearing the consequence that might follow from the closeness of almost 200 persons in a narrow and poorly ventilated space, obtained for the prisoners permission to walk for an hour in the morning and the same in the evening in the monastery garden.

The imprisoned priests had no illusion about the lot reserved for them. Father de Cussac, a priest of St. Sulpice, had the Acts of the Martyrs brought to them. From this they made their spiritual reading. Some friends, authorized to visit them for the purpose of bringing them food, kept them acquainted with news from the outside. Thus they learned that a guillotine had been erected in the Place de Carrousel and that a military court, established August 17, every day pronounced terrible sentences, which were followed by prompt execution.[123] On August 26 the Assembly seemed to intend to save the lives of the non-juring priests, by decreeing against them the penalty of deportation. But the very ones that passed this law were not fooled by this pretended moderation. Says Michelet: "No one was in doubt about the massacre."[124] On August 28 Danton obtained authorization for domiciliary visits. These visits resulted in new imprisonments at the Abbaye, the Carmelites, and La Force. The populace milled about these prisons, with cries of death. At midnight on September 1, a commissaire, escorted by gendarmes, came and notified the prisoners of the decree of deportation passed by the Assembly and he attempted to assure them that no danger of death threatened them. But the previous evening the Commune had irrevocably determined their fate. It had instituted a committee of execution, charged with providing all the details of the bloody work that was about to be done. A significant letter issued from this committee, written to citizen Maillard. He was there directed to "dispose his band in a useful and sure manner, to take precautions so as to prevent the cries of the dying, . . . to have a provision of brooms to sweep away the blood."[125]

---

[121] Quoted by Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise catholique en France* (ed. of 1873), XIX, 512.

[122] This seminary took its name from one of its superiors, Father Robert. See Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier,* III, 100, and Gosselin, I, 58. On the arrest of Father Gallais, cf. I, 295–98.

The Taking of Verdun

In spite of the guarded secret of these preparations, most of the prisoners had not changed their conviction that they were soon to be put to death. The successive taking of Longwy and Verdun stirred up the populace. The Legislative Assembly, where scarcely 260 out of 750 members were in attendance at the sessions, was aware of its political powerlessness. The Commune was now more insolent than ever. Danton, in the presence of the German invader, urgently appealed for concord. But on what ground was concord to be made? In connection with an enrollment of volunteers, that was to take place on September 2 at the Champs de Mars, Danton declared: "The tocsin that is about to be rung is not a signal of alarm: it is the charge upon the enemies of the country. To overcome them we have need of audacity, and still audacity."

---

[123] Picot, *op. cit.*, VI, 213; Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

[124] Michelet, *Histoire de la Révolution,* IV, 121.

[125] Senar, *Relations puisées dans les cartons des comités de salut public et de sûreté générale,* chap. 7; Guillon, *Les martyrs de la foi,* I, 169.

What was the real import of these last words? Men could recall that recently in the Jacobin club Danton had exclaimed: "Let the Confederates not separate before the traitors have been punished." [126] On August 31, at the vigilance committee of the Assembly, he said: "We cannot remain exposed to the fire of the enemy and to that of the royalists. . . . We must put fear into the hearts of the royalists. . . . Yes, fill them with fear." And a gesture of a death stroke completed his thought. So, when (September 1) Letourneur tried to reassure the prisoners by giving them a false glimpse of the possibility of liberation, one of them (Tessier) replied: "No, my son, we shall not go forth from here." [127] As we learn from the account of an eyewitness, "soon someone came to ask the old men to what place they wished to be taken upon leaving the Carmelite monastery. Everyone went to confession. The question was discussed whether they could offer to take the oath in the event that such an act might lead to their being released, or to accept it if it were proposed to them. It was decided that they would have to refuse it." [128] The executioners could come; the martyrs were ready.

---

[126] *Journal des Jacobins,* no. 201.

[127] *Souvenirs inédits de M. Letourneur,* quoted by Alexander Sorel, *Le Couvent des Carmes,* p. 78.

The September Massacres

At noon on September 2 the alarm cannon at the Pont Neuf thundered: a large black flag was raised on the city hall. According to the announcement, all this had for its purpose to arouse some legions of heroes against the enemy; what the signal actually did was especially to set in motion a band of assassins against the prisoners of the Commune.

The number of men in this band has been exactly computed; they were not more than 150.[129] But for six days they terrorized Paris and governed as masters. At their head was a young man twenty-nine years old, married three months before, Stanislas Maillard by name. Presently he received a confidential mission from the Commune. He was the son of a merchant of Gournay, and worked as receptionist clerk in the office of his brother, Thomas Maillard. Tall, thin, elegant in his dress, a good talker, fond of appearing and orating, he was to be seen in the first ranks of the agitators in most of the revolutionary manifestations. The *Moniteur* listed him among the vanquishers of the Bastille; on October 5 he placed himself at the head of the Parisian women and returned in a carriage of the court to receive the compliments of the members of the municipality. Maillard was cruel by pose, as Danton was by passion, Robespierre by cold logic, and Carrier by bestial instinct. In the massacre at the Carmelites, was he the knowing agent of Marat and of the Commune? The collection of testimonies and documents scarcely admit of any doubt about this fact. The role of secret emissary was that of his whole life. His existence is full of suspicious dealings and dubious missions. A striking fact is that, continually regarded with jealousy by his accomplices, denounced by his enemies, several times imprisoned, Maillard always found powerful protectors to defend him or to release him.[130] Though weakened and spitting blood, he is seen, even to the time of his death (1794), spying, examining, and directing a band of spies enrolled by him and paid by the Sureté générale,[131] engaged in hunting "the game of the guillotine."

---

[128] Report of Abbé Montifleury (*archives du Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, Papiers Emery*, III, 3).

[129] G. Lenôtre, *Les massacres de septembre* (1907), p. 9.

Massacres at the Abbaye

Most of the arrested priests had been directed either to the prison of the abbaye of Saint-Germain or to the prison of the Carmelite monastery. The abbey of Saint-Germain then consisted of immense structures, chapels, cloisters, assembly halls, cellars, and kitchens, all opening on a courtyard almost square in shape, at the side of the church of Saint-Germain-des-Pres.[132]

About two hours had passed since the ringing of the tocsin. A band of cutthroats, with Maillard at its head, had gathered in the courtyard of the monastery, awaiting the arrival of the prisoners whom Billaud-Varenne had promised to bring there.

Regarding the scenes of savagery that took place that evening, we possess two important documents, independent of each other, each of them coming from an eyewitness of the events: the report of Méhée de Latouche, secretary of the Commune, and that of Father Sicard, the renowned teacher of the deaf-mutes, saved from the massacre by the courage of a citizen, who recalled this priest's services to humanity.

The time was about half-past two.[133] Father Sicard writes:

---

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 331.

[131] Cf. *ibid.*

[132] Some important fragments and a complete façade remain. These can be seen by anyone entering into the court of the house which bears the number 14 bis of rue de l'Abbaye.

[133] Méhée, in Lenôtre, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

> We arrived at the Abbaye. The courtyard was filled with an immense throng.[134] Our carriages were at once surrounded; one of our comrades thought he could escape; he opened the door of the carriage, jumped into the midst of the crowd, and was at once butchered. A second person made a like attempt; he squeezed his way through the crowd and proceeded to escape; but the assassins fell upon this new victim, and blood flowed again. A third met the same fate. The carriage went ahead toward the hall of the committee; a fourth prisoner then sought to escape; he received a stroke with a sword . . . With the same rage the murderers turned on the second carriage.[135]

Says Méhée:

> I saw blood gushing in streams. "We must kill them all, they are knaves," shouted the crowd. The fourth carriage contained only corpses. . . . The bodies of the dead were thrown into the courtyard. The twelve prisoners who were still alive stepped out of the carriages to enter the hall of the civil committee; two of them were slain as soon as they set foot on the ground. The committee did not have the time to proceed even to the briefest examination. A multitude armed with knives and swords poured in, snatched the prisoners and slaughtered them. . . . It was now five o'clock in the evening. Billaud-Varenne, the substitute for the procurator of the Commune, arrived. He stepped over the dead bodies, made a short harangue to the people, ending thus: "People, you are slaying your enemies; you do your duty." [136]

Twenty-one prisoners thus perished upon arriving in the courtyard of the Abbaye. Of a sudden, at the side of Billaud-Varenne, a voice called out, the voice of Maillard: "Nothing more is left to be done here. Let us go to the Carmelites." [137]

---

[134] According to the documents published by Granier de Cassagnac in his *Histoire des massacres de septembre,* it was supposed until recent years that the massacre took place on the very threshold of the prison. Father Bridier's publication in 1896 of the *Mémoires de M. de Salamon,* internuncio, who was likewise a witness of the assassinations, has proved that they took place in the heart of the Abbaye, in the court of the garden, under the windows of the guest house. See the plan in Lenôtre, pp. 168.

[135] *Relation de l'abbé Sicard,* quoted by Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* XI, 70.

[136] *Relation de Méhée de Latouche,* quoted by Lenôtre, pp. 178–82.

[137] Méhée, *op. cit.,* cf. Lenôtre, p. 182.

The Massacres at the Carmelite Monastery

At the Carmelites, after noon, the guards had been relieved. The new guards were men of sinister appearance, wearing the red cap and armed with pikes. At two o'clock the commissaire of the committee of the section had ordered the prisoners to go to the garden for their daily walk. Even the aged and the sick were forced to go out. We have the following report from one of these prisoners. He says: "We withdrew to the far end of the garden, behind a hedge; others sought refuge in a little oratory situated in a corner of the garden, where they began to recite their Vespers."[138] Suddenly cries were heard from rue Vaugirard. "Now, Monseigneur," cried out Father de la Pannonie, turning to Archbishop du Lau of Arles, "I believe they are going to assassinate us." To this the Archbishop replied: "My dear Father, if it is the moment of our sacrifice, let us thank God that we can offer Him our blood for so fine a cause."

The prisoners were not mistaken. A few moments before, in the church of St. Sulpice, transformed into the assembly hall of the Luxemburg section, a wine merchant, Louis Pirère, after leaping into the pulpit, which thus became his rostrum, there declared that he would not budge so long as they had not yet freed themselves of the prisoners and especially of the priests detained in the monastery of the Carmelites. Thereupon the Assembly decided "to purge the prisons by pouring out the blood of all those detained."[139] A band of raging men set out from the church in disorder and turned toward rue de Vaugirard. Upon reaching rue Cassette, this group met another band armed with swords and pikes dripping with blood. This was

---

[138] *Relation de l'abbé Berthelet de Barbot.*

[139] The original of the official report of this session has been found in the archives of the palace of justice by Dom Leclercq and has been published by him for the first time in 1912 in *Les martyrs,* XI, 67.

Maillard and his band, who were coming from the Abbaye. The two troops merged and irrupted into the monastery of the Carmelites.

Father Berthelet wrote: "At first we saw enter in fury seven or eight young men. Each of them wore a belt carrying pistols, besides the one he held in his left hand, and at the same time, with his right hand, he brandished a sword." [140] The assassins first, with strokes of the sword, struck down Father de Salins, who was absorbed in some reading; then, wounding or killing those they met on their way, they rushed to the end of the garden, crying out: "The Archbishop of Arles! The Archbishop of Arles!" Archbishop du Lau, who was kneeling before the oratory, arose and turned toward the assailants, saying: "I am he whom you seek." A violent blow of a sword was dealt him on the forehead. A second stroke from behind opened his skull. Three other blows brought him to the ground, where he lay unconscious. Then a pike was thrust into his breast, and the assassins trampled him underfoot.[141]

While a hunt was organized in the garden by the murderers, a good number of prisoners entered the church. They took their stand before the altar, giving absolution to one another and reciting the prayers of the dying.

Meanwhile one of the leaders, on whose identity the accounts do not agree but who seems to have been Maillard himself,[142] installed himself before a little table near the door opening on the garden. He had brought to him the list of the imprisoned priests, proceeded to the calling of the prisoners, asked each one whether he persevered in refusing the oath, and, upon an affirmative answer, sent him back to the garden, where the prisoner was immediately massacred amid furious outcries, among which could be distinguished the cry of, "Long live the nation!"

---

[140] *Relation de l'abbé Berthelet de Barbot,* quoted by Lenôtre, p. 253.

[141] Guillon, *Les martyrs de la foi,* III, 39.

[142] This is the opinion of Alexander Sorel, in his *Le couvent des Carmes,* p. 132. We note a striking similarity between the procedure used at the Carmelites and that which Maillard carried out two hours later at the Abbaye. Cf. Leclercq, p. 77.

Thanks to the disorder, several managed to escape by crossing the garden and climbing over the wall of the enclosure. Almost 120 priests lost their lives in less than two hours. In the annals of Christianity the date of September 2, 1792, shines with a halo equal to that of its most glorious days. The prison of the Abbaye "has almost entirely disappeared today; but the monastery of the Carmelites, which still stands, with its church, the gloomy corridor where most were massacred, the oratory where the holy Archbishop of Arles fell, remains one of the most venerable monuments of the Church of France.

Further Massacres

These memories cannot make us forget the seventy-six priests who perished the next day at the seminary of St. Firmin, the three priests who were slaughtered in the prison of La Force,[143] and those who, on the night of September 2, met death at the Abbaye. After the massacre at the Carmelites, Maillard returned to the Abbaye and there, with a similar procedure, he organized a slaughter. Among the prisoners who were made to appear before him, Maillard found himself faced by the former minister of foreign affairs, whose wily policy had been long engaged in deceiving the vigilance of the Holy Father: this was Count de Montmorin. Says Méhée: "The ex-minister declared that he did not accept the members of the commission as his judges, that they did not hold the office of judges." In the presence of this accused man, who spoke so haughtily, Maillard exercised a cruel irony. A moment before, an agreement had been made that, "to avoid any scene of violence in the interior of the prison, the word 'death' was not to be pronounced in the presence of the condemned; merely 'To La Force' would be said.'"[144] "Since you hold that your affair does not fall under our jurisdiction," said the president, "you are going to be sent to La Force." Montmorin thought he had won his case and, in a mounting tone of contempt, he replied: "Mr. President, since you are so called, I beg you to provide me with a carriage." "You will have it," replied Maillard coldly. Montmorin went forth from the hall and was at once massacred.[145]

---

[143] At La Force was slain Father Jean-Baptiste Bottex. Dementhon has written a most interesting life of him. Dementhon, *Vie de l'abbé J.-B. Bottex.*

Scenes no less horrible occurred in the other prisons of Paris, at Le Châtelet, the Conciergerie, the Tour Saint-Bernard, the Seminary of St. Firmin, at Bicêtre, and the Salpêtrière.[146]

While the blood was thus flowing in Paris, on September 3 the Commune's committee of execution and vigilance sent to all the municipalities of France the following circular, signed, among others, by "Marat, the friend of the people"—thus he called himself in the document itself—and countersigned by the minister of justice, Danton.[147] "The Commune of Paris eagerly informs its brethren of all the departments that a party of ferocious conspirators detained in the prisons has been put to death by the people; acts of justice which seemed to them indispensable to restrain by terror the legions of traitors enclosed within its walls, at the very moment when it was about to march against the enemy: without doubt the nation will hasten to adopt this means, so useful and so necessary." [148]

---

[144] *Relation de Méhée,* in Lenôtre, p. 187.

[145] Cf. Lenôtre, p. 191.

[146] Cf. Taine, *Les origines,* VI, 56; Mortimer-Ternaun, *Histoire de la Terreur,* III, 399, 592, 602–6. An informative process was undertaken in 1901 by order of Cardinal Richard for the canonization of the priests put to death for the faith during the days of September, 1792. The investigations of Bishop de Teil have resulted in the presentation of a list of 217 martyrs. See this list in Leclercq, *op. cit.,* pp. 137. The discoveries made by Bishop de Teil in the National Archives enabled him to point out several inexactitudes that escaped the patient studies of Alexander Sorel. The learned prelate, in an interesting report (July 5, 1904) remarks that the martyrs of September appeared like a representation of ecclesiastical France. They belonged to all the ranks of the hierarchy; the secular clergy were there associated with the religious orders; Bayonne and Nancy, Brest and Lyons, Boulogne-sur-Mer and Embrun are there likewise represented. See A. C. Sabtié, *Les massacres de septembre: les martyrs du clergé.*

[147] Danton's responsibility in the September massacres, a responsibility denied by Aulard, *Histoire générale,* VIII, 152, 155, has been long studied by Seligman, in a memoir read at the session of January 27, 1912, of the Academy des sciences morales et politiques. From documents indicated by Seligman, it appears that Danton, as also Roland, at first held aloof from the affair. He took part only when he saw the Girondins threatened with being affected. His intervention with Robespierre then brought an end to the massacres, which ceased on September 6. In any event, as

Not fully satisfied with this bloody mission, the Commune had sent into the departments emissaries charged with the execution of its wishes. On September 3, Paris revolutionists arrived at Reims and there arrested four priests, who were soon massacred by the populace.[149] The next day, at Meaux, seven priests were put to death under the same circumstances.[150] On September 3 a certain Fournier, an atrocious fellow, called "the American," who had taken part in the massacres of September, decided on the execution of forty-four priests at Versailles. Among these was Bishop de Castellane of Mende who, it was said, received the confession of all the prisoners.[151] On all the roads groups of priests who, to escape from the fury of the assassins, were making their way toward the frontiers, were assaulted, maltreated, stabbed, attacked with stones or clubs, thrown into the rivers.[152]

Says Taine:

Welschinger remarked in the same session, too much insistence cannot be stressed on Danton's personal responsibility as minister of justice.

[148] Quoted by Papon, *Histoire de la Révolution,* VI, 277.

[149] Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 220.

[150] *Ibid.,* p. 221.

[151] *Ibid.,* p. 222.

[152] See Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 223. At Gacé in Normandy, four priests on their way to Le Havre were slain; Father Valframbert, a Capuchin, was put to death at Alençon, with atrocious refinements of cruelty; Father Loiseau was cast into a river and was held under water until he expired; four priests of St. Sulpice who were making their way toward the frontier were slain at Couches, near Autun; Father Cartier, vicar of St. Madeleine at Aix, was massacred at Antibes while on his way to Italy. Many other names might be added to this list. On the murder of Father Valframbert, see Piolin, *L'Eglise du Mans pendant la Révolution,* II, 144, and Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* XI, 151.

In the departments we count by hundreds the days similar to that of September 2. On all sides the same fever, the same delirium indicating the presence of the same virus; and that virus was the Jacobin dogma. Thanks to that dogma assassination clothed itself in the garb of political philosophy; the most outrageous attacks became lawful, for they were the acts of the lawful sovereign, charged with providing for the public safety.[153]

The Oath of Liberty and Equality

Two legislative acts, passed in the course of the events we have just narrated, should evidently have halted the massacre of non-juring priests. On August 10, 1792, the Legislative Assembly, with a view to suppressing mention of the king in the formula of an oath which it had been the first to violate, prescribed the taking of a new oath worded thus: "I swear to maintain with all my strength liberty and equality, or to die in their defense." The new formula not only passed over any mention of fidelity to the king, but it made no allusion whatever to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Moreover, on August 26 the Assembly passed a law subjecting the non-juring priests to deportation. This law, by its severe provisions, aggravated the former law of deportation (May 27); but, as it carried precise penalties against a refusal to take the oath, this new law should logically have put an end to the arbitrary proceedings and penalties which the municipalities introduced regarding refractory priests. We may even suppose that many of those who voted for the August law of deportation had in view a restraint on deeds of popular fury, whose terrible outbursts might easily be foreseen. A return to pity is understandable even in the soul of a Jacobin. Men are never as good or as bad as their principles.[154]

---

[153] Taine, *op. cit.*, VI, 65.

[154] During the September massacres, Danton had saved the life of Father Lhomond, his former professor; Robespierre, former pupil of Father Bérardier, snatched him

However that may be, nothing now stopped the course of the massacres, and the new oath of liberty and equality—the little oath, as it was called—had as its particular effect the provoking of painful differences and grievous discussions among the Catholics; the refusal of the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy had united faithful priests into a compact and disciplined batallion; that union was now broken.

The fifteen bishops remaining in France and also a few *émigré* bishops, such as Boisgelin and Barral, authorized their priests to take the oath; most of the prelates residing abroad declared such an act illicit. Almost all the clergy of Paris, the members of the congregations of the Oratory, of St. Lazare, and of St. Sulpice, some houses of the Sorbonne and of Navarre, took it.[155] Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice, wrote: "The equality, as we understand the term, can be quite innocently promised because, 1. the clergy and the nobility have given up all their pecuniary privileges; 2. all our criminal laws make no distinction, based on diversity of rank, among various convicted persons; 3. the admission of all subjects to all offices and employments has been recognized and accorded by the King, to whom the clergy and the nobility have fully acquiesced." [156] Worthy prelates, like Bausset and La Luzerne, saw, moreover, an interest of the first order for the clergy in not appearing to be the adversary of a political liberty wisely understood, in not crediting the calumny of those who loudly proclaimed the incompatibility of Catholicism with liberty. On the other hand, some ecclesiastics, no less commendable for

---

from death; Maillard himself, by a semblance of improvised tribunal, contributed to saving the lives of several prisoners. Lenôtre, *Les massacres de septembre,* p. 331. Robespierre used to give alms to the poor. Lenôtre, *Vieilles maisons,* II, 62. Hébert used to write *Le Père Duchesne* at the side of his wife, who was kneeling in prayer (*ibid.,* II, 377), and Fourquier-Tinville wore about his neck a medal of the Blessed Virgin (*ibid.,* II, 289). Regarding this last mentioned, see A. Dunoyer, *Fouquier-Tinville.*

[155] *Annales catholiques,* I, 466.

[156] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 273.

their intelligence and their virtue, saw in the oath of liberty and equality a formula at least captious. Every profession of faith, they said, must be interpreted in the sense intended by him who imposes it. But, if we are to interpret the words "liberty and equality" by the acts of those who apply them under the egis of the government, these words signify only a revolutionary liberty and equality, destructive of the legitimate government and the Catholic religion.

Maury, who was then living in Rome, where he had been consecrated archbishop of Nicaea and where he was in close touch with the *émigrés,* became the vigorous spokesman of this latter opinion. He wrote: "This oath seems to me more perfidious and impious than the first. The first was merely heretical; this one consecrates rebellion. . . . As to its perfidy, that is well proved, since this formula has seduced so many people of good will and of good minds." [157] And the fiery prelate, who later so gravely disobeyed the Holy Father, let it be known that the attitude he was attacking was perhaps prompted by a lack of courage or a lack of loyalty to the Holy See. The superior of St. Sulpice replied, with the pride of a father who could appeal to the testimony of the blood shed by his children: "Monseigneur, the living members of my Company are nearly all dispersed in different parts of Christendom and are not involved in the matter of the oath. I say 'the living members'; for thirteen have been massacred; and I have the consolation of seeing my Company, though the smallest of all, give more martyrs in this cause of the Church and of the Holy See than all the other secular companies together.[158] But some remain about me, and we are neglecting nothing to show the Holy See our boundless attachment." [159]

---

[157] Méric, *op. cit.,* I, 272.

[158] The Company of St. Sulpice counted, in 1791, about 500 members. From 1792 to 1794, eighteen of them poured out their blood for the faith. See Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 451. Almost all the religious communities were represented in the bloody martyrology. The Jesuits, dispersed since twenty-five years before, were present at the moment when they would have to offer their lives in the cause of God and the Church. Out of the 217 martyrs at the Carmelites on September 2, we count twenty-four Jesuits, that is, an eighth of the victims.

Father Emery had in mind to suspend his judgment and to determine his opinion on the basis of authority; but communications with Rome, too slow and difficult, did not allow him to receive in time an effective direction from the Holy See. In these circumstances the priests of France, reduced to the necessity of taking counsel only with themselves, experienced that torment of delicate and courageous souls that would not hesitate to die in the performance of their duty, but that do not know precisely where that duty lies. Father Emery, wishing to reply to the chief objection of his adversaries, placed himself in relation with Gersonné, the reporter of the decree on the "little oath" and submitted to him the commentary he had drawn up on it. Gersonné fully approved this commentary. At length a reply from Rome arrived. It was dated October, 1792. The Pope, faithful to his prudent and patient policy, declared that, before deciding about the oath in question, he wished to know what was the exact meaning attributed to the words "liberty and equality." In the month of May, 1793, Cardinal Zelada, the Pope's minister, who was consulted by Father Emery, replied: "The Pope has made no pronouncement on the oath in question; if it is purely civic, it may be taken." In various briefs (October 5, 1793; April 1 and July 29, 1794; April 22, 1795) the Pope merely makes the same reply, with some precise details, namely: 1. that he does not pronounce a decision on the oath; 2. that he does not require any retractation by those who have taken it.[160] This waiting attitude, conformable to the general policy of Pius VI, now appears to us as the wisest that could be taken by him who had the formidable responsibility of the supreme government of the Church; but the anguish of souls, called upon to form their conscience by themselves, continued to remain painful.[161] Soon it would be renewed in connection with new oaths, but then the question will be placed on a clearer terrain, and the Holy See's reply will be a categorical condemnation.

---

[159] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 326.

[160] Dom Piolin, in his *L'Eglise du Mans pendant la Révolution,* II, 93, maintains that Pius VI had, "by a decision addressed to the Chambery chapter, condemned the oath of liberty and equality as formally culpable." Misermont, in an article in the *Revue des études historiques* (January–February, 1910), published the text of this decision and, abandoning Piolin's opinion, concludes simply that the Pope, while respecting the persons of those who have sworn, is clearly opposed to the oath itself. We cannot share this conclusion. The Pope declared merely: 1. that the oath will

The Convention (1792–95)

While the Catholics were greatly disturbed in conscience over these grave problems, the Legislative Assembly was succeeded by the Convention. The newly elected deputies were

---

have to be regarded as evil "if, from the circumstances, it is found to be according to the other heretical and schismatical decrees that purposed destroying the Church"; 2. that those who have taken the oath with a doubtful conscience will have to put themselves in line with their conscience. These are the two particular solutions of cases of conscience which Father Emery undoubtedly had in mind to bring into question, for they are merely the application of the most general principles of moral theology. See St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Theologia moralis,* Vol. III, no. 148. On the question of the oath, see, besides the works already cited, J. Meilloc, *Les serments pendant la Révolution.*

[161] We have before us a paper that circulated among the faithful at this period. It says: "The bark of Peter is violently stirred, and the tempest spreads such a darkness that we can hardly see to guide ourselves. . . . Peter and Andrew are rowing on one side, James and John on the other; all four of them undoubtedly intend to save the bark, but they may be putting it in great peril. Where shall we find our safety? No doubt, in the middle. Let us remain between the four rowers; let us not create a schism with anyone. Let us hold to the middle, at the feet of Christ who seems to be sleeping. Let us awaken Him by our prayers. Let us cry out to Him: 'Lord, save us, we perish,' so that He may arise and command the tempest and He may restore the calm." Thus did the Catholics pray. The Freemasons did not suffer the same anxieties. In an undated address, composed on the occasion of the feast of the Federation, the Draguignan lodge thus expressed itself: "We swear, on the word of Masons, to maintain the Constitution with all our means and, if need be, to combat with the flaming sword the aristocracy, despotism, and all the tyrants of the earth. . . . In our vast republic of brethren, our ties can become the conductors of that civic electricity which ought to establish, in the machine of the world, an equilibrium of happiness." *Archives nationales,* C. 123, no. 398, quoted in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LXXXVIII (1910), 532–34.

divided into three hostile groups, suspicious, ready to devour one another: the Gironde (Girondists), the Plain, and the Mountain. Two passions, however, dominated these internal hatreds: an almost delirious patriotism, intoxicated by the recent victories in which the Republic's "volunteers in sabots" had repulsed the old armies of the European coalition; and the rage to make an end of the two secular powers, only half overcome, whose bloody debris still barred the way to the triumphant Revolution: the Church and the monarchy.

In this history of the Church, our task does not require us to relate in detail the political work of the Convention: the proclamation of the Republic (September 21, 1792); the strife between the Mountain and the Gironde; the trial and condemnation of the King; the first coalition, formed against France by William Pitt; the treason of Dumouriez; the fall of the Gironde; the uprisings in the provinces; the war, becoming the pretext for a Jacobin dictatorship; Lazare Carnot "organizing the victory," while Marat organizes the Terror; the guillotine permanently established; Marat, Hébert, and Danton put to death; the Revolution "devouring its children like Saturn"; Robespierre alone remaining unscathed and, amid the military triumphs of France, victorious beyond her borders, dreaming of founding, under the egis of the Supreme Being and of Reason, some sort of bloody Salian priesthood; the new dictator himself falling; the subsequent reaction; the "gilded Youth" gathered about Talien, drunk with pleasures as well as with vengeance; lastly, the "giant Assembly" tired and discredited, despite its important financial and administrative reforms,[162] declaring (October, 1795) its mission terminated, at the very moment when the political scene witnessed the appearance of the young general who would become master of the French Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte.

---

[162] To the Convention must be credited the uniformity of weights and measures, the creation of the Institute and the Normal School, the Polytechnic School, the Central School of public works, the Conservatory of arts and trades, the National Institute (Conservatory of Music), and the Bureau of Longitudes, the final organization of the Institute of blind youth, and the opening of the Museum of the Louvre.

The policy of the Convention remain unchanged on one point, the religious persecution. One of the first concerns of the Assembly was to assure the execution of the deportation decree against the non-juring priests; the last of its acts was the proclamation of general amnesty, from which the refractory ecclesiastics were expressly excepted.

Under the Legislative Assembly the situation of the faithful priests had grown daily worse; their security became more and more endangered. Most of them, separated from their bishops who, after the example of Bishop de Juigné, had chosen to expatriate themselves, leaving their powers in the hands of vicars general; not finding in these vicars the authority, promptness, and firmness of decision which the pending difficulties required; pursued by bitterly hostile municipalities; and, in many places, given over to the mercy of the popular movements, at every moment stirred up by some impromptu agitators; many priests, among the better ones, judged that the moment had come for them to follow the counsel of the Master: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another." [163] After the emigration of the nobility, that of the clergy began.

These two emigrations do not deserve the same judgment of history. The emigration of the nobility, especially that of 1789, which one lawmaker called "the emigration of pride," has been the subject of well-founded criticism. We would do them an injustice if we regarded these noble *émigrés* as accomplices of the foreigner. They were French after their own manner. If several of them asked Europe to intervene in the affairs of France, by way of monarchical solidarity, "these very men would have throttled the first person that spoke of paying for the intervention with a single fortress of the kingdom."[164] But when at Brussels, Turin, Mainz, and Coblenz certain wealthy lords, who smiling departed from France "until the squall should pass over," scandalized their hosts by the frivolity of their manners and the skepticism of their spirit. They deserved the severe blame which the venerable Cardinal Pacca indignantly expressed in a celebrated memorial.[165]

---

[163] Matth. 10:23.

Quite different was the attitude of the *émigré* clergy and, we must acknowledge, also of that part of the nobility which became voluntary exiles only in the last extremity, when the ruin of their châteaux and the organization of a regime of exception in their regard, had rendered their situation intolerable in France. Toward the end of 1792 the emigration of the clergy took on considerable proportions. The latest biographer of Pius VI says: "The numerous stagecoaches no longer were enough to transport the fugitives. All the roads leading from France to Spain, England, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, and especially to Italy were jammed with ecclesiastics and monks who were fleeing from prison and death."[166]

The *Emigré* Priests

The priests of Languedoc turned their steps toward Spain. The Catholic peninsula seemed to them to be a sure asylum. There, however, they met with many disappointments on the part of the civil authorities. Indeed, few statesmen were more opposed to the Revolution than Florida Blanca, the prime minister of Charles IV; but this opposition extended to France herself. "Florida Blanca had such a horror of the French ideas that the *émigrés* themselves appeared to him to be dangerous people. In July, 1791, a royal edict subjected foreigners residing in Spain to the closest and most humiliating surveillance of the police. . . . The edict was drawn up in general terms; but in reality it was directed against 13,000 Frenchmen who had become established in the peninsula." [167] Count Aranda, who succeeded Blanca at the beginning of 1792, effected an altogether opposite policy. Aranda had been known by his campaign against the Jesuits. He had lived in Paris for seven years and had introduced Freemasonry into Spain.[168] His ministry was even less favorable to the *émigré* priests. However, this ministry was of short duration. The too famous Godoy, who replaced Aranda in August, 1792, had a vain and vile soul with only one ambition: to hold on to the power at any price. He cynically declared that he longed to come to a good understanding with the Jacobins, provided his own security was assured.[169] Nothing good was to be expected from the initiative of such a man. But an energetic action in favor of the *émigrés* did not seem impossible.

---

[164] L. Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 159. Chateaubriand has strikingly set forth the case of conscience which the patriotism of the *émigrés* asked itself, and the replies that they gave to their doubts. See Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* (ed. Edmond Biré), II, 33–35; and *Essai sur les Révolutions*, pp. 428–34.

[165] Pacca, *Œuvres*, II, 261.

[166] Gendry, *Pie VI*, II, 195. All of chapter 30 of this work, based solely on archival documents, is devoted to this emigration of the clergy and the measures taken by Pius VI on that occasion.

A noble gentleman of Languedoc, Count Antraigues, and his worthy mother, Madame Sophie d'Antraigues, generously took up the defense of the French priests who had sought refuge in Spain. They stirred to action the Spanish ambassador to Venice and Cardinal Bernis; then, having obtained the assurance that a suggestion from His Holiness would be received with satisfaction by His Catholic Majesty,[170] they begged the Pope to intervene. Pius VI gladly acquiesced to this desire, and the King of Spain declared his readiness to accord hospitality to the French ecclesiastics, "provided they should not gather in large numbers and that they should faithfully observe the laws of the country." [171] The welcome accorded to the proscribed priests by the Spanish clergy was admirable. Montserrat Abbey in Catalonia opened its doors wide to the persecuted. The archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Lorenzana, and Bishop Quevedo of Orense in Galicia were conspicuous for their liberal hospitality.[172] According to one calculation, Spain received about 7,000 French priests.[173]

---

[167] Desdevises du Dezert, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* VIII, 727.

[168] *Ibid.,* p. 278.

[169] *Ibid.,* p. 729.

[170] *Archives vaticanes, Nunziat di Madrid,* quoted by Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 196.

England received the *émigré* priests of Normandy, Brittany, and the border provinces. On September 16, 1792, it already counted 3,000 of them and, about the middle of the next year, almost 8,000. The general enthusiastic good will which Great Britain showed in these circumstances is one of her most beautiful titles to the gratitude of the French nation.

Moreover, beginning fifteen years earlier, the situation of Catholicism in England had improved. The preoccupations caused by the war which resulted in the independence of the United States had led the government of George III to desire no enemies on the side of the Roman Church. The two rival statesmen who contested for the power, Pitt and Fox, took the same view of this matter. Laws passed in 1775 and in 1780 gave to English Catholics reliable guaranties for their ownership of property, their worship, and their teaching. The Catholics of Ireland and Scotland were in the way of obtaining, with the same guaranties, access to all judicial careers and to almost all the honors previously reserved to the Protestants. Yet the attitude of public opinion toward the French Revolution was wavering. No one is unaware of the deep influence exercised by the English philosophers on the men who had just given a new constitution to France, and many gloried in that influence.

---

[171] Dispatch of the Spanish nuncio; cf. *Ibid.*, p. 197.

[172] See the testimony of Father Nicard in *L'ami de la religion* (1814), Vol. II. Cf. Barruel, *Histoire du clergé*, p. 342.

[173] This is the figure given by Father Contrasty in his interesting study, *Le clergé français exilé en Espagne* (1792–1802), published in 1910.

Mackintosh in his *Vindiciae gallicae,* composed in 1791, praised the work of the Constituent Assembly; Thomas Paine, more radical, in his *Rights of Man,* made of 1791 and 1792 a parallel between the two revolutions, the English and the French; Fox, the adversary of the house of Bourbon, declared himself a friend of the new France. Conformable to these ideas, the "Society of the Revolution" called for the suppression of the tithes; the "Society for the Development of Constitutional Knowledge" undertook a campaign for universal suffrage; the "Corresponding Societies," with their center in London, had continual relations with the clubs of Paris and inclined toward the Republic.[174] But, on the other hand, the excesses of the Revolution alarmed the reflecting and industrious people of Great Britain. From the end of 1790 one of its most powerful thinkers, Edmund Burke, was the eloquent spokesman of this apprehension in his *Reflections on the French Revolution,* in which he pointed unerringly, as the end of an unexampled anarchy, to the most absolute despotism which has ever appeared under heaven.[175] Pitt, the eminent statesman, whose clear, practical, and always calm mind seemed to embody the best qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race, openly declared himself against Jacobinism. Yet on one point the liberalism of Fox, the wisdom of Burke, and the conservative policy of Pitt met: a breath of sincere humaneness animated these men, as well as the whole British nation, whose illustrious representatives they were, and as it did also the King, whom they purposed serving with different opinions; and this sentiment made them sympathetic to the misfortunes of the French *émigrés.*

A first group of proscribed priests set foot on the shores of England in August, 1791.[176] They received a hearty welcome.

---

[174] Sayous in *Histoire générale,* VIII, 644.

[175] See also his *Letters on a Regicide Peace.* [Tr.]

[176] The Bishop of Saint-Pol-de-Léon, harassed by the government police, fled to England in 1791 and settled in London. There he remained almost alone until

We let one of these exiles comment on the event. Says Father Barruel:

> A person must have been three years in France amid the Constitutionalists, Girondists, Maratists, and Jacobins of all sorts, to experience fully how much restfulness and delight that first welcome of the English brought to each of these priests. It was like the sweet awakening of the soul which, after being long tormented with the image of monsters and furies, comes out of that frightful dream and finds about it only reassuring and peaceful objects. I know this from my own experience and from that of my brethren deported along with me.[177]

Bishop Lamarche of Saint-Pol-de-Léon, who was living in London since the previous year, sought to obtain help for his unfortunate compatriots. Wilmot, a member of Parliament, placed himself at the head of a committee of initiative that made an appeal to the public. Edmund Burke eagerly espoused the cause of the proscribed; he even drew up an address, that was inserted in all the newspapers and that brought in more than 84,000 francs. The next year Parliament voted a sum of money intended for the succor of the *émigré* priests and nobles; this appropriation was repeated every year, and, according to one calculation, up to 1806 a total of 42,620,000 francs, had been distributed.[178] Father Carron, a holy priest of Rennes whose devotedness to the popular classes had not saved him from the persecution of the Jacobins, in 1792 founded in Jersey two schools for the instruction of the *émigré* youth, a chapel for the exercise of Catholic worship, pious associations, and a library for the priests. Four years later at London, aided by the Bishop of Saint-Pol-de-Léon and sustained by the personal benevolence of King George III, he was able to extend his good works.

August, 1792. Father de Lubersac, *Journal historique et religieux de l'émigration et de la déportation du clergé de France en Angleterre,* p. 1.

[177] Barruel, *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* p. 349.

[178] Picot, VI, 241. For the details, see Lubersac, *Journal de l'émigration,* pp. 16–30; Barruel, *op. cit.,* pp. 351–55.

Establishments of benevolence and chapels were erected, thanks to him, in several quarters of London,[179] and Chateaubriand is the genuine and eloquent echo of the general opinion of his time, when he calls Father Charron "the Francis of Paula of the exile, whose renown, revealed by the afflicted, penetrated even through the fame of Napoleon." [180] England became as it were the heart of the emigration. London received the larger part of the men whose talent was an honor to France.[181] At London, Archbishop Boisgelin of Aix published his metrical translation of the Psalter, Father Barruel his *Histoire du clergé de France pendant la Révolution* and his *Mémoires sur le jacobinisme,* Delille his poem, *La pitié,* and Chateaubriand began his *Essai historique sur les révolutions.*[182] The French priests did not limit their activity to their ministry in favor of their fellow countrymen. We quote the following tribute of Father Madaune.

> Our confessors of the faith spread into the different counties. Some became tutors in rich families; others opened schools; some founded missions. Of these missions the district of London alone, including the present dioceses of Westminster and Southwark, counted thirty. The most important were at Chelsea, Kennington, and Hommersmith. High Mass became a general practice in the London chapels. English and Irish priests profited from the help brought by these foreigners to engage more actively in the care of their scattered flocks. At the same time many of the anti-Catholic prejudices disappeared from the spirit of the Protestant people when they found themselves in contact with the life and the example of these confessors of the faith, as pious as they were resigned. We may well believe that the admirable British

---

[179] One of the chapels then erected in London was founded by Francis Emmanuel Bourret, a priest of St. Sulpice, under the title of Our Lady of the Annunciation. See Lubersac, *op. cit.,* p. 46.

[180] Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* I, 178. On Father Charron, see *ibid.*

[181] Antonin de Saint-Gervais, *Histoire des émigrés français,* II, 9, 13.

[182] Chateaubriand, *op. cit.,* II, 190. Father de Lubersac in his *Journal de l'émigration* has a long chapter entitled, "Liste des principaux ecclésiastiques français qui, pendant leur émigration à Londres, ont publié des ouvrages sur la religion ou qui y ont quelque rapport; courtes analyses de ces ouvrages," pp. 188–271.

charity was pleasing to Him who promised a reward for a cup of water given in His name and that, from that hour, England rewon her rights to religious truth.[183]

The *Emigrés* in Germany

Pius VI, upon learning of the charitable welcome given by the English nation to the persecuted priests, at once sent to King George III a brief of felicitations.[184] Soon his attention was especially drawn to the situation of the *émigré* priests in Germany.

In Germany the reaction to the revolutionary movement divided the people of the country. Nowhere perhaps had the principles of the Revolution aroused a greater sympathy among intellectual men; but also nowhere did the progress of the Revolution provoke a firmer opposition among statesmen. Kant recognized in the Declaration of the Rights of Man the principles of right, autonomy, and liberty, which he had made the basis of his moral system. With still warmer passion, Fichte had taken up the defense of Jacobinism itself.[185] The "friends of lights," continuing Lessing's work, spread the ideas of liberty and of political renovation. A group of young poets, taking their inspiration from Klopstock,[186] celebrated, in the French Revolution, the rationalist and mystical character of its inspiration. Those who, gathered about Jacobi, were reacting by the cult of sentiment against the followers of an excessively dry intellectualism, united with them in admiration of the new ideas, and the Illuminati of Weishaupt's school surpassed all in the admiration they professed for the new principles.[187]

---

[183] Madaune, *La Renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre,* p. 7.

[184] Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 197. Gendry quotes several other briefs sent to Bishop Lamarche, Edmund Burke, Andrew Stuart, and others.

[185] In 1793 Fichte published the *Zurückforderung der Denkfreiheit von den Fürsten Europas;* in 1794, his *Beiträge zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums über die französische Revolution.*

[186] Klopstock, the author of the *Messiade,* had glorified in verse the States General of France with the same pen that had just celebrated the advent of Christ.

All the currents of German thought seemed to merge in the glorification of the Revolution and in its work; but all the political interests appeared to be menaced by it. In fact, as Cardinal Pacca, then nuncio at Cologne, remarks in his *Memoirs,* "the first objects that infuriated the French philosophers and revolutionists were the aristocracy, the feudal system, the clergy's power and wealth. But all that was in full vigor in Germany, a country essentially aristocratic and feudal, where the clergy was sovereign over a great part of the country." [188] Furthermore, many of the German nobility had considerable possessions in Alsace, in Lorraine, and in Burgundy. The decrees passed on the night of August 4 had injured these lords in their feudal rights. The Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia, at the instigation of the deputies of the Upper Rhine district, intervened with Louis XVI to ask of him the re-establishment of the former state of affairs. Besides, the statesmen of Germany no longer were blind to the significance of the French Revolution. Cardinal Pacca reports two statements by Kaunitz, minister of the court of Austria, and by Hertzberg, minister of the court of Prussia. The former was asked how long the movement begun in France would last. "A long time, perhaps without end," answered the aged minister. Count Hertzberg used to repeat to anyone willing to listen: "The Revolution will make the tour of Europe." [189]

The arrival of the first *émigrés* did but increase the confusion of ideas and feelings in the midst of which Germany was struggling. The historian of the French *émigrés* does not hesitate to acknowledge that the nobility "displayed too much luxury at Coblenz," that they had not "the grave and austere tone suitable to proscribed men," and "that such an attitude was able to lead to that principle of indifference of which the sovereigns had given many proofs." [190] Cardinal Pacca says without evasion:

---

[187] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* I, 175, 177–81; G. Blondel in *Histoire générale,* VIII, 715–22. On the movement of political and social philosophy in Germany of that period, see Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale* (2nd ed.), II, 620–84; Harald Höffding, *History of Modern Philosophy.*

[188] Pacca, *Relation sur sa nonciature de Cologne* in his *Œuvres complètes* (French tr., 1845), II, 250.

[189] Pacca, *op. cit.,* II, 250.

> The close relations I had with the *émigré* nobles almost made me lose hope of seeing an end to the evils that desolate France. Most of these nobles, especially the great lords of the court, practice no act of religion; furthermore, they publicly affect a complete indifference for all religious principle. The city of Coblenz has, so to speak, become a new Versailles; the same cabals prevailed, the same court intrigues, the same dissoluteness, without concern for the public. These examples gravely scandalized the Germans and did much harm to the Catholic religion in Germany.[191]

The documents recently published by Vaissière fully confirm this appraisal by the papal nuncio.[192] The conduct of some *émigré* bishops was unfortunately subject to similar criticism. Says Pacca: "It is known that the great majority of the French bishops were an edification for all Europe; but I must confess with bitterness that the conduct of a small number of them was far from corresponding to the high opinion which had been entertained of them. Some pious ladies of Cologne, who were expecting to venerate in them Hilarys and Eusebiuses, were astonished at seeing their uncanonical manner of dress and the frivolity of their conversations in the world of high society." [193] The lower clergy saved the honor of the Church of France. Says Pacca: "The priests belonged mostly to the venerable class of curés. They maintained a conduct truly edifying and fully justified the good repute which had preceded them." [194]

---

[190] Antonin de Saint-Gervais, *Histoire des émigrés français,* I, 112.

[191] Pacca, *Œuvres complètes,* II, 262.

[192] P. de Vaissière, *Lettres d'aristocrates* (1907).

[193] Pacca, *op. cit.,* p. 261.

[194] *Ibid.*

Bishops and priests had received a generous hospitality in Germany, both from the princes and from the people. But the invasion of Savoy in September, 1792, by General Montesquiou, and that of Belgium in November by Dumouriez drove into Germany a still greater number of fugitive priests. New efforts and sacrifices became necessary. On September 21, 1792, after the invasion of Savoy, Pius VI wrote a brief to the entire clergy of Germany, recommending to their charity the persecuted priests of France.[195] The German people responded to this appeal in a noble manner. Thanks to the zeal of Cardinal Caprara, nuncio at Vienna, several Austrian monasteries opened their doors to the unfortunate exiles. Relief funds were organized and associations were founded to provide help for their needs. The city of Munster and its bishop, Maximilian, elector of Cologne, were particularly outstanding by their zeal and generosity.[196] Some nuns exiled from France were placed in various houses and by their virtues edified the persons who gave them hospitality.

The Swiss cantons showed themselves worthy of their old renown for hospitality. As Barruel says:

> The Swiss could not offer the same help as the opulent nations; but they had the heart of benevolent people. At sight of these homeless priests they sheltered them under their rustic roofs. The peasants went out to wait for them along the highways to offer them lodging. . . . A just gratitude then inspired in these priests the desire to make themselves useful to these patriarchal families. They gave lessons to the children. Some of them even helped in domestic labors. Father Dubois, professor in the Orléans college, writes: "I have seen several of these priests mowing hay with as much assiduity as the peasants who had received them in hospitality." [197]

---

[195] Gendry, II, 199.

[196] Picot, VI, 237, according to a manuscript memoir of Father de Sagey, vicar general of Mans, an eyewitness of the facts related by him.

[197] Barruel, *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* pp. 343, 345.

The Holy Father sent (April 20, 1795) the avoyer and the council of the canton of Fribourg a brief of felicitation praising the charity of all Switzerland.

The *Emigré* Priests in Italy

From the southeast part of France more than 3,000 priests took the road to Italy. As in Spain, England, Germany, and Switzerland,[198] the austere life of most of these priests and the example of their virtues gave edification to the people. To a considerable extent this edification compensated for the scandals given to the foreigner by the writings of the French philosophers and by a large number of the *émigré* lords. In all Europe the French clergy, providentially scattered by the storm, were preparing, in suffering and humiliation, for the Catholic revival that would follow the Revolution.

The propagation of the revolutionary ideas had found in Italy both great obstacles and earnest accomplices. The obstacles came not only from the government and the privileged classes of the peninsula, who were not less mistrustful of the new ideas than were those of the great states, but also the common people. These found themselves more bound to the life of the local aristocracy, less weighed down by taxes, more inclined perhaps than people elsewhere to prefer to the abstract freedom preached by the Revolution the concrete and tangible freedom which their local rulers granted them. They valued the ease which the oligarchies of Venice and Genoa and the paternal administration of the papal court procured for them. A favorable reception of the revolutionary ideas was to be found in the survival of that republican spirit which had agitated Italy of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and in the excessive individualist temperament referred to by Tasso when he wrote:

---

[198] A certain number of priests took refuge also in Belgium, Holland, and Russia.

Alla virtu latina
O nulla manca, o sol la disciplina.[199]

The same spirit was likewise met with in the emotionalism which may be explained by the climate, and especially in that "fondness for conspiracies, the habit of secret societies,"[200] which were then being perpetuated at Naples, Venice, Milan, and Rome, in the lodges of the Freemasons and the Illuminati.[201] However, in the Italian people habits of a sincere and deep faith persisted.

The crimes of the Convention divided the various currents that were mingled in Italy. The princes, one after the other, entered the coalition that was formed against the French Revolution; the wild enthusiasts and the Freemasons organized into clubs, which maintained continual relations with the Committee of Public Safety.[202] Persons of deep faith were moved to pity at seeing the French priests, arriving daily in larger numbers, who, to follow their conscience, left their own country and resigned themselves to beg their daily bread from the charity of their brethren. Cardinal Costa, archbishop of Turin, in a pastoral letter (October 5, 1792) recommended these exiles to the charity of his faithful. The other prelates followed this example. Chapels, houses of hospitality, and provisions of clothing were placed at the disposal of the unfortunate fugitives, who lacked everything. The nobility and rich persons were admirable in their devotion.[203]

The influx of the French priests into Italy, principally into the Papal States, suggested to Pius VI the thought of creating "the pious work of French hospitality." In fact, this work existed from the very beginning of the emigration; but it was fully organized only at the end of September, 1792. Its president was the Secretary of State, who was admirably seconded by Monsignor Caleppi, former auditor of the nunciature at Vienna.[204] The *émigrés* were distributed in four large cities: Bologna, Ferrara, Perugia, and Viterbo. On October 10, 20, and 30, 1792, circular letters were sent out by the Secretary of State to all the monasteries of Italy, recommending the French priests to them. To maintain discipline among the numerous *émigrés,* two important regulations were published by the Pope: one on January 26, 1793, the other on January 25, 1794.[205] Twenty-four exiled prelates were gathered about the Pope. Among them was to be seen Philippe Casone, count of Villeneuve, vice-legate of Avignon, whom the Revolution had forced to flee successively from Avignon to Carpentras, from Carpentras to Chambery, from Chambery to Rome; Archbishop Giovio of Avignon, who had experienced almost the same vicissitudes; the bishops of Sisteron, of Vaison, and of Carpentras. This last, who had come on foot from Savoy to Rome (October, 1792), had been preceded by one of his diocesans, Father Jean Siffrein Maury, the mighty orator whose eloquence had held its own in the face of that of Mirabeau. The Pope, wishing to recompense the services rendered to the Catholic cause by this courageous priest, made him titular archbishop of Nicaea. Maury merited the gratitude of the Church. In difficult times his unruffled composure, the vivacity of his repartees, and the flexibility of his logic, had, in the face of the revolutionists, made him a formidable champion. But the greatness of his talent was not equaled by nobility of character.

---

[199] During a journey in Italy, Kant complained of not finding the French spirit of sociability and society. Cf. A. Fouillée, *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens* (1903), p. 93. The Italian historian Ferrero says: "A single Italian is worth more than a German, but four Germans together are worth more than twelve Italians" (*L'Europa giovane*, p. 376).

[200] Fouillée, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

[201] C. Cantu, *Gli eretici in Italia.*

[202] Pingaud in *Histoire générale*, VIII, 762.

[203] For details, see Auribeau, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la persécution* (1794), Part IV.

---

[204] Gendry, II, 198.

[205] Cf. *ibid.,* II, 200 ff.

The new prelate in 1792, in the name of the Pope, performed some useful missions;[206] but he shared too intimately the grudges of the lay *émigrés,* intervened too haughtily in the question of the oath, and finally compelled the Pope to suspend him from his functions of bishop. A greater figure was that of François d'Aviau, archbishop of Vienne, who, driven from his diocese by the persecution, reached Rome, after various wanderings, at the beginning of 1794. Pius VI valued the holy prelate, who in 1795 directed from Rome the three dioceses of Vienne, Viviers, and Die. In 1797, disguised as a peasant, he evangelized, at peril of his life, the mountains of Vivarais and Forez. Finally, in the archiepiscopal see of Bordeaux, he gave the example of the loftiest virtues.[207] Like this pious bishop, most of the *émigré* ecclesiastics at Rome there showed a new zeal for the spread of the gospel. In times of persecution as in those of prosperity, the Eternal City always showed itself the center and head of the Catholic Church.

The emigration extended outside the limits of Europe, reaching beyond the ocean to America; in the New World, as in the Old, it sowed the seed of future harvests.

The *Emigré* Priests in America

The American Revolution, although starting with a Declaration of Rights similar, from the political point of view, to that which the French Revolution adopted later, did not have the same antireligious character. The first amendment of the American Constitution forbids Congress to prohibit the free exercise of religion. The appointment (1789) of Bishop Carroll, a personal friend of Washington, to the see of Baltimore, did more than found the Catholic hierarchy in the United States; it appeared to all as a pledge of fruitful peace between the Church

[206] Gendry, II, 206.
[207] Lyofnet, *Vie de Mgr d'Aviau.*

and the state. But, in the vast extent of the apostolate which then opened out, the needed apostolic workers were lacking. The number of Catholics scattered in the different states of the Union has been estimated at 24,000; and the clergy amounted to only twenty-two priests.[208] A college founded by the Jesuits at Georgetown in 1786 was the only institution which the Church possessed; it had neither parish schools properly so called, nor girls' boarding schools, nor seminaries, nor hospitals, nor charitable institutions.[209]

But in 1791 Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice, alarmed at the progress of the Revolution and inspired by the spirit of the venerable founder of his Company, Father Olier, resolved to send some priests of his Congregation to that foreign and free land. These new missioners devoted themselves in a special manner to the formation of a native clergy, destined to spread amid the Protestants and the Indian tribes the love of the Catholic Church. Upon accomplishing this work, they would return to a freed and peaceful France, there to resume the direction of seminaries and to raise up the Church again from its ruins.[210]

No proposal could have been more welcome to Bishop Carroll of Baltimore, who joyfully accepted Father Emery's offer. On April 8, 1791, four Sulpicians (Fathers Nagot, Levadoux, Tessier, and Garnier), accompanied by five seminarians, embarked at Saint-Malo on a ship that was chartered for them. A few laymen were permitted to join them. Among these was Vicomte Chateaubriand, who in the introduction of his *Voyage en Amérique* and in his *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* has left us a brilliant account of this voyage.[211]

---

[208] A. Guasco in *Missions catholiques,* I, 165.

[209] G. André in *Dictionnaire de théologie* (Vacant), under the word "Amérique," I, 1054. Guasco (*loc. cit.*) also mentions a convent of Carmelites.

[210] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 104.

[211] Biré ed., I, 310. Another account of this voyage, drawn up by Father Mondésir, one of Father Nagot's companions, and preserved among the manuscripts of the

On July 10, 1791, the little group of Sulpicians landed at Baltimore. Other priests, driven from Santo Domingo by the bloody insurrection of the Negroes, soon joined them. In short, from 1791 to 1799, twenty-seven French missioners, twelve of them Sulpicians, took their place among the clergy of the United States. Of these priests six became bishops: Flaget at Bardstown, then at Louisville; Cheverus at Boston; Dubourg at New Orleans; Maréchal at Baltimore; Dubois at New York; David, as coadjutor, at Bardstown and at Louisville. Of Bishop Flaget, whose life and vigor were prolonged beyond the common limits, it was said that, in his apostolic journeys, he marked an episcopal see by each of his principal stops.[212] Under the direction of such valiant bishops, the *émigré* priests performed wonders. Stephen Theodore Badin founded the mission of Kentucky; his brother Vincent that of Michigan, among the savage tribes of the Algonquins, the Ottawas, and the Sioux. Gabriel Richard, sent to Detroit, there preached the faith over a district vaster than France and Spain; he was later elected a representative to Congress.[213] The young Catholic centers of the United States began the course of their brilliant destinies. Once more God manifested the fruitful vitality of His Church.

The first apostles of Greece and Rome were victims of Jewish persecution. The early spread of the gospel among the barbarians had been owing to the bishops who were proscribed by the Roman Empire. The conquests of St. Francis Xavier in Asia had closely followed in the sixteenth century the ravages of Protestantism in Europe. So too, the end of the eighteenth century, which witnessed the efforts of impiety to destroy the Church in the European nations, saw the birth of a new Church

---

St. Sulpice Seminary, has been published by Victor Giraud in his *Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand* (1912), pp. 156–74.

[212] G. Moreau, *Les prêtres français émigrés aux Etats-Unis* (1856), pp. 81–87.

[213] On Gabriel Richard, a Sulpician, born at Saintes in 1767, of Francis Richard and of Marie Geneviève Bossuet, see Bertrand, *Bibliotheque sulpicienne,* II, 107. The city of Detroit has erected a statue to Gabriel Richard, as one of the most eminent men of the state of Michigan.

beyond the Ocean; and France, the heart of the revolutionary agitation, prepared the cradle of this new birth.

Fresh Outbreak of Revolutionary Persecution

The news he received from the young Church of America cheered the heart of the Supreme Pontiff. But two tragic events deeply afflicted him. We refer to the murder of the French agent at Rome, Bassville (January 13, 1793), and the execution of King Louis XVI at Paris (January 21). The former of these events let loose new hatreds against the papacy. The death of Louis XVI, by becoming the pretext for a revival of the foreign war, became the starting point of a more bloody, general, and methodically organized persecution, one that was more terrible than what had been suffered up to then: for the priests, for the religious, for all the peaceful citizens of France, it was the Terror.

Since the withdrawal of Bernis and the Pope's refusal to receive Count de Ségur,[214] the diplomatic relations were broken between the Holy See and France. But neither the Legislative Assembly nor the Convention was resigned to remain apart from the important movement of relations and ideas that was centered in Rome. Not only did the clubs of Paris maintain about the Holy See emissaries charged with exercising a surveillance over the so-called plots of the counterrevolution; but, when the Pope decided to proceed with rigor against the agitators, the French minister at Naples, Mackau, determined to intervene to protect them.[215] This Mackau, an intriguing and ambitious person, desirous of succeeding Bernis at Rome, was seconded, after August 12, 1792, by a no less disturbing secretary, whom the favor of Lebrun, the minister of foreign affairs, had raised to that post. The name of this son of an Abbeville dyer, was Nicholas Jean Hugon, but he was more commonly known as Bassville. He was said to have been a deacon, secularized since the Revolution.[216]

---

[214] Gendry, II, 156. The memoir sent by the Pope to all the nuncios on this subject is dated May 29, 1791.

[215] For instance, in the affair of Ratter and Chinard, see Gendry, II, 222. Mackau had been sent to Naples by Dumouriez as minister plenipotentiary on April 30, 1792.

On November 13, 1792, Bassville arrived in Rome, installed himself there, and presented himself to the Secretary of State as a simple traveler. He soon assumed the attitude of an accredited diplomat, seized upon every circumstance to take the defense of the French nationals, gave banquets to his countrymen, organized investigations, informed minister Lebrun of the military forces at the disposal of the Papal States. The revolutionary press then clamored for the invasion of Rome and the deportation of the Pope.[217] Bassville boasted of obtaining from the Secretary of State, who feared him, whatever he wished. In the month of December he installed himself with his wife and child in the palace of the Academy of France.

Bassville had not reached the term of his insolences. A circular issued by Monge, minister of the navy, dated November 28, 1792, directed all consuls to replace, over their entrances of the consulates, the fleur-de-lis escutcheon by the monogram of the Republic, adding, however, that "the substitution should be subordinated to times and circumstances." Taking no account of this last clause, Bassville, accompanied by Charles de Flotte, a young naval officer of the old nobility who had bowed to the new ideas, notified the Holy See of the circular of Monge; then, without waiting for the Pope's reply, on the night of January 1, 1793, he had the fleur-de-lis escutcheons taken down from the palace of the Academy and the residence of the consul. He then prompted the students to pull down the statue of Louis XIV, the founder of the Academy. A few days later, in that same palace, a statue of Brutus was installed, and about it speeches were delivered. Following these agitations, the mob dragged through the streets the statue of Louis XIV and the statues of several popes and cardinals.

---

[216] *Ibid.*, pp. 184, 223.

[217] F. Masson, *Les diplomates de la Révolution.*

But the Pope replied (January 8) to the request of France by a letter addressed to the consul. Pius VI opposed to the demands of the French government an explicit refusal, giving his reasons for the refusal. The Republic, he said, by withdrawing its ambassador, broke all diplomatic relations with the Holy See; why should the Holy See recognize the Republic? The new government of France was not yet recognized by any cabinet. The act requested of the Pope seemed to be a tacit approval of all that had been done in France against religion. The Pontiff could not forget that in France, on March 3, 1791, they had burned his briefs and also an effigy of him; that at Avignon they had driven out his nuncio; that at Marseilles they had torn down his coat of arms from the house of his consul, and had hung it at a lamp-post and broken it in pieces; and that, when the Holy See protested against these acts and demanded the replacing of the coat of arms, the French government replied that the circumstances did not permit it to satisfy the claims of the Holy See.[218]

As soon as the Pope's reply was communicated to him, Mackau broke out in bitter denunciations and directed Flotte to express his protestation to the Pope. Flotte executed his mission brutally. He transmitted his dispatch to the Secretary of State, threatening him with the destruction of Rome if the Pope persisted in his refusal.

Such events could not occur without deeply arousing public opinion. That Bassville who, without any official title, so insolently lorded it over the consulate, the Pope, and the Roman state, became odious. If we are to credit the report of Digne (the French consul), Flotte and Bassville, when coming down the steps of the Vatican after the accomplishment of Flotte's last mission, expressed their dissatisfaction so clamorously that the report of it spread rapidly among the people.

---

[218] Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 226; Artaud de Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Popes,* VII, 233 ff.; *Moniteur,* February 4, 1792, p. 166.

On Saturday, January 12, the rumor spread that, on the following day, the coat of arms of the Republic, that is, a Minerva wearing a Phrygian cap and holding a spear in her hand, would be set up at the consulate. The papal government, foreseeing an outburst of popular wrath on that occasion, reinforced the police with a body of soldiers.

These precautions, however, proved to be in vain. On Sunday, January 13, at four o'clock in the afternoon, the very hour when the streets were filled with unusually large throngs of people, Flotte, Madame Bassville, and her son, were crossing the city in a carriage, the coachmen and footmen wearing the Republican cockade, the young Bassville waving a tricolor flag. The Roman people supposed all this was an expression of defiance of them. Stones were thrown at the carriage. Someone cried out: "Down with the cockades!" A shot, fired from the carriage, increased the irritation. Flotte was surrounded by the crowd as he tried to flee into the house of a French banker, where Bassville then was. Bassville appeared, with a pistol in each hand. He had taken these pistols from Flotte to prevent his using them. The assailants thought that Bassville meant to make use of these arms. Someone of the throng, who has remained unknown, struck him in the stomach with a dagger. Flotte succeeded in fleeing by way of the roof of a neighboring house; but Bassville could not be saved. He died, after repudiating all the oaths he had taken in opposition to the laws of the Church, and received the sacraments, declaring that he had been the victim of Flotte's imprudences.[219]

At the first reports of the disturbance, the Pope gave orders to General Caprara to direct his forces against the disturbers.

---

[219] Gendry, II, 228–32. The *Moniteur* of February 4, 1793, published the report of Digne, French consul at Rome, which substantially agrees with the account given above.

The soldiers arrived in time to protect the Academy of France and the houses of some friends of Bassville, that were assaulted or threatened. Some priests were appointed to preach the restoration of peace and calm in the public squares. Pius VI, not satisfied with sending his own physician for the care of the wounded man, personally made arrangements for the obsequies of Bassville, facilitated the departure of Flotte, as also of Bassville's wife and son, and had a detailed report of the incidents sent to all his nuncios.

But Flotte reached Paris and related after his own manner the events of January 13. The Convention made common cause with him, adopted the son of Bassville, and drew up a whole plan of campaign against the Pope, unless he would subscribe to the following conditions: public apology, immediate acceptance of the Republic's coat of arms, expulsion of the *émigrés* from the Papal States, and an indemnity to the Frenchmen who suffered from the uprising.

Execution of Louis XVI

While the Convention was thus threatening the Pope, events of utmost gravity were being precipitated in France. On December 11 the Convention had made Louis XVI appear at its bar to undergo a humiliating examination. He was obliged to return on the 26th, accompanied by his defense attorneys, Malesherbes, Tronchet, and de Sèze, who tried in vain to exculpate him from the charges brought against him and to stir the pity of the Assembly in his favor. The party of the Mountain had already decided: they intended "to defy Europe by throwing at it the head of a king." The Girondists were divided. A formidable pressure was exercised on the hesitants. On January 15 the Assembly unanimously declared the King "culpable of conspiracy against the liberty of the nation and of attempts against the safety of the state." On the next day, out of 721 members voting, 337 decided for the penalty of death without condition, against 334 who favored conditional death or imprisonment. Among the 17 Constitutional bishops present at the session, five condemned Louis XVI to the penalty of death; 18 Constitutional priests out of 25 took the same stand.[220] On January 21, in the public square, "formerly called Place Louis XV," the King of France died on the scaffold with a nobility of attitude, a courage, a piety, a forgetfulness of the outrages received, a self-abnegation, and a confidence in the eternal justice which make of his last moments one of the greatest examples of virtues that can be proposed to men. Says one historian: "For the first time since he began to reign, Louis appeared to be master of his role. The Convention, by stripping him of the royal mantle and the crown, which weighed him down, disclosed in him the man, who possessed the most touching virtues of mankind." [221]

Pius VI, who had always nourished a tender esteem for the King of France, at news of his death showed a deep impression of sadness and indignation. Five months later, at the secret consistory of June 17, his emotion had not lessened. He went so far as to give Louis XVI the title of martyr, for, he said, "who can doubt that this king was slain principally out of hatred for the faith and because of his fidelity to Catholic dogmas?" But the hope which the Pontiff had kept in France was now deeply shaken. "O France, France!" he exclaimed, "you who in the fervor of your faith and devotion to the Apostolic See, did not follow others, but always went ahead of them, know that the faith is what makes the firmness of kingdoms, because it is the faith that suppresses the abuses of governments and the unrestrained license of the people." [222]

---

[220] Their names may be found in Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 265.

[221] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* III, 269.

[222] Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de France, 1790–1800* (1857), I, 177–91.

Consequences of the King's Execution

The grief of the common father of the faithful was fully justified. The execution of Louis XVI would be the pretext, for the European coalition, of a fierce war against France; and the foreign war would become the occasion of an unprecedented revival of persecution by the Convention.

The desire to avenge the death of Louis XVI was merely the sentimental pretext of the great coalition that combined against France, under the direction of William Pitt: England, Holland, Spain, Austria, Germany, Prussia, Naples, and Piedmont. The bravado of Danton, setting the natural limits of France at the ocean, the banks of the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was a more genuine reason; but the chief motive was the hope of sharing the provinces of France, which was thought to be unable to withstand the allied nations. France would, however, inflict on them a brilliant defeat and, though deprived of her king and even subject to the most revolutionary authority, would defend the integrity of her soil with unconquerable energy.

But the necessity of national defense favored the establishment of a dictatorship, which was exercised especially against the priests and the Catholic religion.

The first act of this dictatorship was the establishment of a revolutionary tribunal. In the midst of the violent excitement produced by the defeat of Aix-la-Chapelle and by the taking of Liége, Barère exclaimed (March 10): "For the saving of our country, the question is not one of dying for it, but of living to disclose the traitors."[223] Robespierre added: "I say that so long as the traitors remain unpunished, the nation will always be betrayed."[224] Following these discussions, the Convention issued a decree. Article 1 was thus worded: "There will be established at Paris an extraordinary criminal tribunal, which will take cognizance of every revolutionary undertaking." [225] Article 6 attached to the tribunal a public prosecutor. He would be Fouquier-Tinville. Article 16 provided that the decisions of this court would be final, without appeal to the Court of Cassation.[226] A few days afterwards, the creation of a revolutionary committee in each commune,[227] then the establishment of the famous Committee of Public Safety "whose duty should be to exercise vigilance over the executive power, to suspend the decrees, and, in urgent circumstances, to take measures of general internal and external defense," completed the organization of the dictatorship. The Convention was armed to act against its enemies, against all that it suspected of being so.

---

[223] *Moniteur,* March 12, p. 324.

[224] *Ibid.,* p. 325.

These enemies were especially the refractory priests. On March 18, 1793, the Convention decided that "any citizen who knows of a priest or *émigré* refractory to the law of deportation, is authorized to arrest him," and that the priest or *émigré* found guilty shall be put to death within twenty-four hours.[228] This provision was a notable aggravation of the penalties imposed by the law of August 26, 1792, which punished with ten years of imprisonment a deported person who returned to France. But up to this time only the priests were aimed at. A decree of April 21–23, 1793, extended the obligation of the oath and the penalties attached to refusal to take it, "to all ecclesiastics without exception, regulars, seculars, and lay brothers." [229] From archbishop and abbot to the lowliest of the brother porters, the entire faithful clergy of France was ostracized and threatened with death.

---

[225] The complete text of the decree may be seen in the *Moniteur* of March 12, p. 326.

[226] *Ibid.*

[227] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[228] *Moniteur*, March 20, 1793, p. 357.

[229] Ludovic Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé*, III, 378.

The decree of October 21, 1793 (30 Vendémiaire) further augmented the rigor of these laws. It punished with death not only the *émigré* priests who should again set foot on French territory and those who should not leave the country within ten days, but also every non-juring priest found having arms (Articles 1, 15, 17). Every citizen was invited to denounce, arrest, or have arrested any priest subject to deportation, with a promise of a reward of 100 livres (Article 18).[230]

> Throughout France they began to arrest the priests en masse. When the prisons could hold no more, they loaded these wretched priests by hundreds on carts and brought them to Bordeaux, Blaye, Lorient, Nantes, and Rochefort. The presence of the English fleet prevented the deportation of these priests to America. But it was rightly considered that a ship's hold would be the harshest prison. At Rochefort the priests were at first put in an old ship that was serving as a hospital for the galleys. There the priests were mingled with the galley convicts. Later two other ships, the *Washington* and the *Deux-Associés,* were assigned them as their prison. For a great number, these ships became their tomb.[231]

These various laws were executed in a terrible manner. In the last of these ships 440 priests, crowded into a narrow space, facing four cannons loaded with grapeshot, could neither stir nor sit down, forced to remain standing all day long. At night they were literally heaped together below deck where each was allowed a space of less than half a square foot. One of these prisoners, Father De La Briche, wrote: "Beyond imagination was the foul and corrupt air, the vileness that emanated from this stinking place and that at the doorway lays hold on you and presses your heart. . . . Often at daybreak two or three of the prisoners were found dead, who had expired during the night. On one occasion as many as fourteen died in twenty-four hours on the *Washington* and the *Deux-Associés.*" [232] Out of 825 clerics taken to Rochefort, 542 perished amid these horrible tortures.[233]

---

[230] *Moniteur* of 2 Brumaire of year II (October 23, 1793), p. 128.

[231] Sciout, *loc. cit.*

The persons threatened and pursued were no longer merely the clergy, but all their helpers, all the faithful, all persons under suspicion of loyalty. The decree of October 21 applied the penalties pronounced against the non-juring clergy to "the public school teachers, lay brothers, and laymen" (Art. 10); [234] and the decrees declared liable to deportation any citizen guilty of harboring a refractory priest (Art. 19).[235] The law of September 17, called the "law of suspects," declared suspect whoever showed himself in any way "an enemy of liberty" or who should not show his "attachment to the Revolution" (Art. 2) and it ordered that every suspect be placed under arrest (Art. 1).[236] The law of Prairial of the year II (May 10, 1794), in the organizing of the revolutionary tribunal, seemed to express the last word of arbitrary procedure and ferocity. Article 4 says: "The revolutionary tribunal is instituted to punish the enemies of the people." "Enemies of the people," declares Article 6, "are those who attempt to change the purity of the revolutionary principles." Article 7 was worded as follows: "The penalty for crimes which fall within the competence of the revolutionary tribunal is death." Article 13 decides that, "if material or moral proofs exist, witnesses' testimony will not be required." Article 16 adds that the law "grants legal defense to patriots, not to conspirators." [237] Revolutionary tribunals to the number of 178 were established in France. From April 16, 1793 to July 27, 1794 (9 Thermidor, year II), the Paris tribunal sent to the guillotine 2,628 persons. Marat had said: "Violence is the means by which we must establish liberty."

---

[232] Quoted by Sciout, *op. cit.*, III, 279–382.

[233] Manseau, *Les prêtres et religieux déportés dans la Charente-Inférieure* (1886). Cf. E. Sevestre, *La déportation du clergé orthodoxe pendant la Révolution.* Register of the non-juring clergy embarked at the principal ports of France, 1792–1793 (1913).

[234] *Moniteur* of 2 Brumaire of the year II (October 23, 1793), p. 129.

[235] *Ibid.*

[236] *Ibid.*, September 19, 1793, p. 1111.

[237] *Bulletin des lois*, I, 1–7.

Likewise by violence Jacobinism, not satisfied with persecuting persons, made an attack on all religious monuments. Bands of "patriots" overran France, sacking churches, profaning them, sometimes even demolishing them. The revolutionary vandalism seized on thousands of statues and paintings of great value. In his report on the vandalism, presented at the session of 14 Fructidor of year II (August 31, 1794), Grégoire declared: "In the realm of the arts, the mere list of objects stolen, destroyed, or defiled would fill several volumes." [238] Church bells valued at 80,000,000 francs, were turned into cannons; the silver articles of the churches were melted down and made into coins. The reliquary of St. Genevieve, with an estimated value of 1,500,000 francs, was taken to the mint on the night of December 6, 1792.[239] At about the same time "at Dijon we see the ten or twelve Hercules of patriotism traversing the town, each with a chalice under his arm." [240] All the ecclesiastical buildings were likewise sequestrated, along with their furniture. Had not the people been told that these possessions form "the patrimony of the sans-culottes"? [241] This property would be "the reward of their valor." [242] The most beautiful reliquaries were the booty of these bandits, and the relics were burned or scattered.[243]

---

[238] Grégoire, *Rapport sur les destructions opérées par le vandalisme,* session of 14 Fructidor of the year II, reprinted at Caen in 1867. See especially p. 44.

[239] Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 311.

[240] Taine, *French Revolution,* III, 261.

[241] *Ibid.,* III, 271.

[242] *Ibid.* These words were the declaration of Desmoulins.

[243] On the vandalism of the Convention, see the details given in the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* of November 25, 1793; see also Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 314–17; Gosselin, in his *Notice sur les instruments de la passion qui se conservent a l'église*

The Liturgy

To drive out the priests, to close the churches, to smash the sacred vessels, and to scatter the remains of the saints did not satisfy the fury of those who, with Holbach, thought that, "when you wish to be occupied usefully with the welfare of men, you must begin with the gods of heaven." [244] The people, deprived of their public worship and of their priests, kept the memory of their saints in the calendar of the civil year. The order of the weeks and months always gravitated about those two great feasts, Christmas and Easter, one of them celebrating the coming of our Lord into this world here to serve us as our model, the other celebrating His resurrection to life eternal to draw us after Him. These two feasts summed up well the whole of religion. The day of rest for working men was always based on a division of time that recalled the creation of the world and periodically brought around the Lord's Day. After being driven out of the churches, Christian piety would have continued to be nourished on the remembrance and the symbols of the liturgical life. In that reminder the Revolution decided to extinguish it. The instincts of destruction are often as unerring as those of preservation.

On October 5, 1793, Fabre d'Eglantine, in a report presented to the Convention, spoke as follows: "The priests had assigned to each day of the year the commemoration of a so-called saint. That catalogue was a collection of lies. We have thought that the nation, after removing this list of the canonized from its calendar, ought to put in their place objects worthy, if not of its worship, at least of its culture, the useful products of the earth, domestic animals, and so on." Consequently a new era, dating from September 22, 1792, the date of the proclamation

---

métropolitaine, relates how the relics of the true cross and of the holy crown of thorns, venerated at Notre Dame, were taken by the profaners.

[244] Holbach, *Système de la nature,* Vol. II, chap. 13.

of the Republic, was decreed. The twelve months of the year were made exactly equal; each was divided into three decades, of ten days each, the last day of each decade being consecrated to rest. Thus the Sunday disappeared. In place of the names of the saints, whose memory was attached to the different days of the year, were substituted names of flowers, plants, animals, and farm implements. Such was the basis of the republican calendar which would remain officially in use in France until January 1, 1806. This reform, besides outraging religion, did not possess the merit of having social usefulness. As a certain historian of the Revolution remarks:

> Whereas by the metric system the Convention offered the nations a basis on which all could unite, by its calendar it suppressed an existing accord; it broke not only with the past but also with the present; it isolated itself in the world; for it could not expect to have the world adopt the era of the French Revolution or to vanquish the universe by imposing this reform on it. The naming of the new months, which Fabre d'Eglantine was so proud of, was hardly exact in its relation to the climate in the two extremities of France. What would have been their unfitness if it had to include, we do not say the antipodes, but merely the northern and southern extremities of Europe, from Sweden to Spain? [245]

[245] Henri Wallon, *La Terreur,* critical studies on the history of the French Revolution (1881), II, 183. The republican calendar was the work of the mathematician Romme and the poet Fabre d'Eglantine. The first year was to begin on September 22, 1792, the day of the proclamation of the Republic. A volume was published with the title, *Manuel pour la concordance des calendriers républicains et grégoriens,* 1806. The following is a summary:

AUTUMN	SPRING
Vendémaire (September–October)	Germinal (March–April)
Brumaire (October–November)	Floréal (April–May)
Frimaire (November–December)	Prairial (May–June)

WINTER	SUMMER
Nivôse (December–January)	Messidor (June–July)
Pluviôse (January–February)	Thermidor (July–August)
Ventôse (February–March)	Fructidor (August–September)

At the end of each year, five supplementary days, or *épogomènes,* were added.

The Constitutional Clergy

The revolutionary ideas had advanced. No longer, as under the Constituent Assembly, was the question that of "returning to the traditions of the early Church," but quite simply of reviving paganism. This attitude of the Convention dissolved the constitutional clergy. Some persons, following Gobel, advocated the abolition of every priestly function and the adoption of the single worship of Reason; others, like Grégoire, protested in the name of Christianity, whose faithful disciples they wished to remain, and strove with all their might against the reborn paganism; some even courageously suffered death for their religious convictions.

We have seen how the constitutional clergy was recruited without great difficulty, at first from the ranks of unworthy priests, then among the Gallicans and the convinced Jansenists. The constitutional Church, if we can apply that name to a body of pastors that had neither unity of belief nor unity of hierarchy, about the beginning of 1793 counted 30,000 pastors or curates.[246] At Paris, Gobel was at the head of 600 cooperators, 500 of them being employed in the parishes.

On November 6, 1793, a simple incident at one of the sessions ended in a result of exceptional seriousness. The constitutional pastor of the parish of Mennecy, whose private conduct had become a public scandal, induced his parishioners to close the church and suppress the public worship. Was such a step legal? The Assembly promptly replied in the affirmative, and the incident was closed.[247] But it was suggestive for those who, like Robespierre, had from the outset of the Revolution dreamed of abolishing in France all positive religion and founding there a natural, civic religion, following the principles of Rousseau. The people were apparently not disposed to accept such an innovation on the part of the government. Would they accept it if, as at Mennecy, it were presented to them on the initiative of their priests?

---

[246] The figure given by Pisani, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[247] *Moniteur,* November 8, 1793, p. 195. On this matter, the reporter declared that "the lawmaker did not recognize any cult but that of liberty, no altar but that of the fatherland, no pontiffs but the magistrates of the people" (*ibid.*). The *Moniteur* said: "These words were applauded by the Assembly."

On the evening of that day (November 6) a deputation of the sections and of the central committee of the popular societies came to the house of Gobel, the metropolitan bishop of Paris. By his situation, by the profession of a religious faith, watered down and false but sincere, Gobel enjoyed a certain consideration among the constitutional clergy. However, he was known to be weak enough to yield to a summons of the committee. Yet a long struggle was needed to bring Gobel to abjure his faith, or at least to annul his ecclesiastical functions and thus to give place to the sole worship of the Supreme Being and of Reason. "I do not know of any errors in my religion," objected the wretched man; "I have nothing to abjure." He was attacked on his weak side. He was told: "The question is simply of sacrificing yourself to the public welfare, to yield to the wish of the people by abdicating functions which they no longer desire." Gobel yielded. "If such is the wish of the people," he said, "very well. The people have elected me; the people dismiss me." [248] The next day Gobel, accompanied by eleven of his vicars, presented himself at the bar of the Convention and there pronounced a discourse which ended thus: "Since no other worship must be but that of Liberty and of holy Equality, since the Sovereign thus wills it, in accord with my principles I submit to its will. From today I give up the exercise of my functions of minister of Catholic worship." In reality, this formula was only a resignation from his functions; but the Assembly wished to see in it an abjuration. Laloy, the president of the Convention, declared: "After the abjuration he has just made, the Bishop of Paris is now merely a being of reason. But I am going to embrace Gobel." The weak Gobel did not dare to protest against this interpretation of his words. He received the accolade of the president and placed his pastoral cross on the desk and put on the red cap.[249]

---

[248] We possess three accounts of the events that occurred on that tragic night: that of Gobel himself, that of Father Grégoire, and that of Gobel's vicar general, Amable Lambert. For the account of this last, see *Ami de la religion,* CXXXVI, 239–42. These three accounts differ in certain details, but they agree in stating that Gobel yielded only through terror to the ultimatum which was brutally presented to him.

Scarcely had Gobel retired when the procession of the other apostates began. Thomas Lindet, married bishop of Eure; Bourdeau, juring curé of Vaugirard; Coupé, of the Oise; Julien, of Toulouse,[250] mounted the tribune and declared, in the vague phraseology of the time, that they were giving up all the functions of worship.

At that moment Grégoire entered. He at once asked for the floor. All thought that he, too, was going to apostatize. The Bishop of Loir-et-Cher expressed himself in these terms: "People speak of sacrifice to the fatherland. I am accustomed to that. Is the question one of attachment to the cause of liberty? My proofs have been given long since. . . . But is religion the question? This article is outside your domain, and you have not the right to attack it. A Catholic by conviction and by feeling, a priest by choice, I have been designated by the people to be bishop, but not from them nor from you do I hold my mission. I have tried to do good in my diocese; I remain bishop that I may continue to do so. I appeal to the freedom of worship." [251]

---

[249] *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*, September 11, 1793; Aulard, *Le culte de la raison*, p. 446; *Moniteur* of November 9, 1793, p. 199.

[250] Sieyès did not make his abjuration until November 9. "Citizens," he said, "ever since several years ago I have abdicated every ecclesiastical character. . . . I have no resignation to give to you; but I have an offering to make to the fatherland, that of an income of 10,000 livres which the law has granted me." *Moniteur*, November 11, p. 208. Julien of Toulouse was a former Protestant minister.

[251] Gazier, *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution*, pp. 212–14. *Moniteur*, 19 Brumaire, p. 200, gives a different version, which Grégoire, in his *Histoire des*

This courageous example found few imitators. For about a month declarations like that of Gobel followed one another on the rostrum.

Despotism of the Convention

Meanwhile the cathedral of Paris had been profaned by a sacrilegious ceremony. On November 10 an actress, arrayed in a white dress and a blue cape, wearing a red cap, and symbolizing Reason, was seated on a platform in the middle of the church of Notre Dame, at the crossing of the transept,[252] amid a theatrical setting, and at her feet choirs sang the *Hymn to Liberty,* to which Joseph Chénier had added the following stanza:

> Descend, O Liberty, thou born of Nature!
> The people now reclaim immortal power;
> On crumbled ruins of the old imposture
> The labors of their hands raise up thy altar.

In the afternoon the goddess Reason was carried on a litter by four citizens and was brought to the Assembly, where she was invited to take her place on the platform beside the president Puis. The deputies, on the proposal of the former Capuchin Chabot, having voted that the church of Notre Dame should be called the temple of Reason, went in a body to the church

---

sectes religieuses, calls an odious falsification. Many evidences do, in fact, show that the *Moniteur,* written by partisans, often falsified the discourses of the orators. The text as we quote it is that given by Grégoire. Did he revise his address when writing it? Perhaps he did so. But what is certain is that Grégoire, summoned to apostatize, energetically refused to do so. Pisani, *op. cit.,* II, 65.

[252] The person who represented Reason on this occasion has been identified. Probably she was a stage singer (James Guillaume, *Etudes révolutionnaires,* 1st ser., p. 54). Only by oratorical metaphor has she been referred to as a woman lightly clad and seated on the altar. Pisani, *op. cit.,* II, 70. The spectacle, as it actually took place, was grievous enough without any exaggeration of the circumstances.

and there added their voices to those of the choristers. Gobel with shame joined the crowd that profaned the august sacred place.[253]

Like ceremonies were celebrated in other parts of France. The head of each *departement* wished to have a feast of Reason. However, this worship was only a passing crisis. After a few weeks it permanently disappeared, along with its founders, Hebert and Chaumette, who were beheaded on March 24, 1794. But the antireligious hatred, thus grotesquely manifested, survived. Chaumette had sworn to "unpriest" the clergy of France. From the outset of the Revolution the enemies of the Church understood that the surest means of accomplishing that result was to favor the marriage of priests.[254] From July 9 to November 15, 1793, the Convention passed no less than five decrees on this subject.[255] The foes of religion soon had reason to rejoice at the result of their legislation. Grégoire, in his *Histoire du mariage des prêtres,* gives the names of twelve married constitutional bishops and reports as two thousand the number of priests who followed their example.[256]

---

[253] A certain liberal historian says: "The writers most favorable to the Revolution no longer pretend to justify these eccentric proceedings. They merely appeal to attenuating circumstances. Aulard says that we should see in these events nothing more than an expedient employed by the Revolution to vanquish the Church that had risen up against the state. . . . Perhaps we would do even better to regard the feast of Reason as an enormous farce." Desdevises du Dezert, *L'église et l'état en France (1598–1801)*, 1907, p. 313. But in fact we should consider it a horrible sacrilege.

[254] See *supra,* p. 118, Robespierre's address delivered during the discussion of the Civil Constitution.

[255] On July 9 the Convention declared that no law will deprive the married priests of their salary; on the 29th of the same month it decreed that the bishops who placed any obstacle in the way of the marriage of priests would be deported or replaced; on August 12 it annulled all dismissals pronounced against priests on the occasion of their marriage; on September 17 it ordered that, if a priest should be disturbed on the occasion of his marriage, he could withdraw elsewhere and receive his salary at the expense of the commune which persecuted him; the law of November 15 declared that "the ministers of Catholic worship who are married will not be subject to deportation or imprisonment even if they did not take the prescribed oaths."

[256] Cf. Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 320–22.

The attitude of many of these apostates was disgusting. Writes Beaulieu in his diary: "On November 22 the Bishop of Périgueux came to the Convention there to pay homage to his wife." [257] Fifteen days later, Chabot informed his colleagues of his own marriage. He said: "All know that I have been a priest, even a Capuchin. I should, therefore, explain the reasons for the resolve I have taken. As a legislator, I considered that my duty was to give an example of all the virtues." "The future wife of Chabot," says Beaulieu, "was Frey by name; she was the sister of two German bankers from whom he acknowledged having received 200,000 francs, the fruit of their fraudulent practices." [258]

We know that more than once the marriage of the constitutional priests was only a pretense; but too often these fictitious unions were changed into real ones and, in all cases, in the eyes of the Church they amounted almost to the same thing.[259] Of better inspiration were those whom the example of Gobel and his followers indignantly aroused and who, following Grégoire, had the courage to protest against the impieties of the Convention. Brongniart, constitutional curé of Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet, declared that he regarded as null the order he had received to close his church. When deprived of his salary, he replied that he had no need of being paid by the Commune for the performance of the functions of his ministry. He was arrested on 3 Frimaire (November 23, 1793) and was imprisoned successively at Sainte-Pelagie, Saint-Lazare, and the Conciergerie. He did not show a moment of weakness. Judged and condemned on 8 Thermidor, he courageously met his death the same day. His confrere, Bénière, curé of Chaillot, had been beheaded a few days before. Some other priests, who had taken the oath, underwent long imprisonment for disobedience to the antireligious laws. Such were the curés of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Saint-Merry, Saint-Jacques, and Saint-Séverin.[260]

---

[257] Quoted by Wallon, *La Terreur,* I, 256.

[258] *Ibid.* The constitutional clergy of France at that time was increased by the addition of some German priests, imbued with rationalist ideas. Cardinal Pacca, in his *Mémoires,* furnishes interesting details about two of these apostates whom he had known personally: Father Dereser, a discalced Carmelite, and Father Schneider, a Franciscan, at first episcopal vicar of the bishop of Strasbourg, then public prosecutor in the criminal tribunal of the Lower Rhine, who was conspicuous for the worst excesses. He was executed on April 1, 1794, convicted of being an agent of the enemy. Pacca, *Œuvres complètes,* French trans., II, 267–69.

[259] When, after the Concordat, Cardinal Caprara was commissioned to regularize the situation of the married priests who asked to be rehabilitated, he rightly showed himself severe toward those lax priests for having tried to save their life by a pretense of marriage.

Although the conduct of a notable number of the constitutional priests was worthy and courageous in the presence of the revolutionary tyranny, the attitude of most of the non-juring priests was heroic. Father Felicité de Lamennais, recalling the scenes he had witnessed in his childhood, wrote in 1808:

> Whereas the mass of the clergy, scattered in foreign lands, there planted the seeds of Catholicism which, fertilized by time, will perhaps some day develop a large number of priests prepared for martyrdom, in France they braved all dangers to distribute to the faithful the helps of the sacraments and the consolations of hope. How many heroic deeds, what lofty traits of devotion I might recall! Never did religion appear more beautiful. If the triumphant philosophy thought up new crimes, persecuted Christianity brought forth new virtues.[261]

The fiery apologist of that day recalled Masses celebrated at midnight in an attic of his home by a non-juring priest on a table transformed into an altar and lighted only by two candles, while the aged servant was on watch outside, ready to give the alarm at the least noise.[262]

Similar scenes took place in all the provinces of France. In the Vivarais, where the lamentable defection of Savine and his pernicious advice had determined the momentary apostasy of a large number of priests, could be seen a simple country girl, Marie Rivier, passing from village to village that had been abandoned by their pastors, teaching catechism to the children, then preaching to the men and women, to reanimate, by all the means in her power, the slumbering faith and zeal. The decree proclaiming the heroic virtues of the servant of God declared that she "filled, as far as the condition of her sex permitted her, the ministry of an apostle." [263]

---

[260] Pisani, *op. cit.*, II, 88–91.

[261] F. de Lamennais, *Réflexions sur l'état de l'Eglise en France.*

[262] Boutard, *Lamennais,* I, 14.

But in that country of France, where two centuries earlier the League took up arms to defend the Catholic religion against the intrusion of heresy, resistance to the Revolution would not be confined to acts of passive protest, to these attempts of religious apostolate. Already from 1790 to 1792 on the field of Jalès, on the borders of le Gard, l'Ardèche, and of la Lozère, more than 30,000 men rose up, a red cross on their breast, with the cry, "Long live the religion!" [264] In the month of September, 1793, the city of Lyons, aroused by the massacre of priests which had taken place within its walls, attempted to shake off the yoke of the Jacobins.[265] Meanwhile a man of undoubted ability and remarkable tenacity, Armand Tuffin, marquis of La Rouërie, had organized in Brittany a vast conspiracy for the purpose of overthrowing the Republic and restoring the monarchy.[266] But all these attempts had been more or less prompted by political considerations. In the spring of 1793, a movement appeared in Anjou, in Poitou, and in Brittany. This movement continued to develop and increase; its leaders seemed to be guided especially by their religious convictions. Thus began the great war of the Vendée and of Brittany which a famous soldier of modern times calls "a war of giants."

---

[263] Decree of the Congregation of Rites, June 13, 1890. Cf. F. Mourret, *La Vénérable Marie Rivier,* 1898, pp. 72, 93–95, 110, 346.

[264] Firmin Boissin, *Le Camp de Jalès,* p. 156. In this study Boissin shows that, of the three federations of Jalès, the first two, composed of 40,000 men, in 1790 and 1791 had an especially Catholic character. The third, composed of 2,000 men only, was undeniably a royalist movement, but it placed at the head of its program the defense of religion. Cf. Ernest Daudet, *Les conspirations royalistes sous la Révolution,* 1881, p. 1.

[265] Guillon, *Histoire du siège de Lyon,* 2 vols., 1797.

[266] Lenôtre, *Le Marquis de La Rouërie et la conjuration bretonne.*

Brittany and the Vendée

Like the rest of France, the people of the Vendée [267] and of Brittany had enthusiastically accepted the first reforms and the first declarations of the Constituent Assembly.[268] But the deep social unrest, which we pointed out in the other provinces, was not felt to the same degree in these regions. The peasants of the Vendée and Brittany had nothing to complain of about the arrogance of their lords except their unreasonableness in the collection of the feudal taxes. With rare exceptions, the Vendean or Breton gentleman resided on his land, in his plain manor house, located at the center of his farm land. The regime of share-cropping prevailed almost everywhere and the relations between owners and tenant farmers were frequent, necessitated by the division of the crops. The peasant received the visit of his lord in his cottage in hours of suffering and mourning; the lord himself, after the office on Sundays and feast days, came to take part in the sober and modest dance in the courtyard of his château. The Vendean clergy shared the hard and poor life of the people of the country; and if the Breton clergy were rich, they claimed no other privilege than that of devoting themselves to the service of the people confided to them. With greater animation in Vendée, more melancholy and grave in Brittany, the man of these districts, unspoiled and industrious, despised both pleasures and death. Respectful and proud, he willingly bowed before two masters, God and the king, but he did not readily bow his head before any other authority. The first assaults delivered by the Revolution on the monarchical institutions of France afflicted him deeply. Nevertheless, says a historian devoted to the monarchy, "we may suppose that, if this sturdy and pious district had not been attacked in its Catholic beliefs, it would have let the Revolution pass without drawing the sword." [269]

---

[267] We use the word Vendée in contradistinction to Brittany, Anjou, and Poitou. The name *Vendée militaire* designates a more extensive region, embracing the *départements* of Vendée, Deux-Sèvres, Vienne, Maine-et-Loire, Loire-Inférieure, Sarthe, Mayenne, Ille-et-Vilaine, Morbihan, Côtes-du-Nord, Orne, Calvados, and Manche (Deniau, *Carte de la Vendée militaire* at the head of his *Histoire de la Vendée*).

[268] Father Felix Deniau, *Histoire de la guerre de Vendée,* 3 vols., 1906–1908, I, 93 ff. The first three members of the clergy who met with the third estate (June 13, 1789) were three curés of lower Poitou. Deniau, *op. cit.,* p. 97.

The first feelings were manifested upon a report of the passing of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, July 12, 1790; then at news of its approval by the King the following August 24. Then juring priests, the intruders as they were called, filled the people with such an aversion that many an intruder was obliged to leave his parish, being unable to endure the void he saw formed about him.[270]

At Plouguerneau 600 men and 4 cannons were needed to install the Constitutional curé. When the authorities proceeded to use force against these recalcitrants, several skirmishes ensued between the peasants and the gendarmes. A farm worker of Lower Poitou, surrounded by a group of gendarmes and armed merely with a pitchwork, offered a desperate resistance. "Surrender," cried out the leader of the gendarmes. Upon his replying, "Give my God back to me," he fell, struck by twenty-two strokes of the sword.[271] Said a certain woman to her husband, who let his hand be cut off rather then burn his catechism: "Hold firm. Your deed is for the good God."

---

[269] Poujoulat, *Histoire de la Révolution française,* II, 43. Cf. Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur,* VI, 260–68.

[270] Cf. Gruget, *Histoire de la Constitution civile dans l'Anjou,* written in 1791 and published in the *Anjou historique,* Vol. III.

[271] These words, worthy of a martyr, were uttered in a battle of May 2, 1791, by a peasant of Saint-Christophe-de-Ligneron, named Guillon. They have been attested by the very gendarmes to whom they were addressed and who were deeply impressed by them. See Deniau, *op. cit.,* I, 211.

At the very time when these events were happening in Anjou, Jean Chouan had already taken up arms in le Maine, along with his two brothers and a few brave peasants. On August 15, 1792, in the town of Saint-Ouen-des-Toits, the headquarters of one of the cantons of la Mayenne, a few miles from Laval, some members of the directory of the district, accompanied by a detachment of gendarmes, had come to enlist a body of volunteers, whose first mission was to go to Laval and there seek the newly appointed constitutional curé. Murmurs arose. The gardarmes were ordered to arrest the "rebels." An uproar of indignation arose. Someone cried: "Down with the patauts; no intruders!" Pataut was the name given to the so-called patriots; "intruder" was what they called the constitutional priests. When acts of violence were about to ensue, a man jumped into the midst of the crowd. With upraised hand he halted the first gendarme who was advancing and with the other hand imposed silence on the gathering. Then he exclaimed: "When the King calls upon us to take arms, we will march. I reply for all. But if we must set out to defend what you call liberty, do you yourselves go fight for it. We all belong to the King, and to the King alone." At once gendarmes, officers, and officials, head over heels, all scattered and fled.[272]

The man who thus took the lead owed to the King that life which he wished to consecrate to the King's cause. He was Jean Cottereau, called Jean Chouan, who, arrested as a dealer in contraband salt, had obtained his pardon from the goodness of Louis XVI.[273] Unlike that in the Vendée, the uprising in Brittany assumed from the outset the character which it kept until the end, that of a clearly royalist war.

---

[272] Duchemin-Descepeaux, *Souvenirs de la chouannerie,* 1852, pp. 45–47. This volume is the second edition of the *Lettres sur l'origine de la chouannerie,* published in 1825.

[273] *Ibid.,* p. 10.

The men who held the power in France did not wait until these last manifestations to be concerned with the obstacles which the spread of the revolutionary ideas might encounter in the western provinces. The Constituent Assembly, disturbed by the disposition which the Vendée showed immediately after the promulgation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, hastened to send there as emissaries two of its members, Gallois and Gensonne. On October 9, 1791, the two commissioners presented to the Assembly a remarkable report on the state of all the departments of the West. In this report they said: "For the people religion has become the strongest and, so to speak, the sole habit of life. . . . The people's constancy in the matter of their religious affections . . . is one of the chief elements that have agitated them and that may agitate them still more." [274] But the halting of the royalist conspiracy of La Rouërie reassured the Convention. Two high police officers, Barthe and Morillon, sent on mission in the West, wrote to the Minister of Justice: "Citizen Minister, La Rouërie dies in an outburst of rage. Its partisans are in the hands of the law. The former province of Brittany is now peaceful; nothing is to be feared from that quarter. We are now going to hunt down the priests and the nobles. . . . This work of sans-culottism will not take long to accomplish." This letter bore the date of March 5, 1793. Eight days later, the Vendée was in open rebellion.

This work of hunting down the priests and the nobles coincided with the extraordinary drafting of 300,000 men, which the Convention had decreed on February 25, 1793, to face the armies of the coalition. The effect was the exasperation of the people of the West. On March 12 the young men of Maufes, having been summoned to go to Saint-Florent-le-Vieil for the purpose of taking part in a lottery drawing, went there, with most of their relatives and friends, armed with pitchforks, scythes, clubs, some even with rifles, marching as to a feast, and crying out: "Long live the religion!" reciting the rosary and singing hymns. A cannon loaded with grapeshot was placed by the commissioners of the district in the public square, and appeal was made to the young men. No one answered the appeal. At some indiscreet and violent words which the republican authorities were thought to have uttered, cries of "Long live religion, long live the priests!" broke out on all sides. The military commander ordered his men to fire. A cannon shot was fired; but, aimed too high, it made few victims. This incident was the declaration of war.[275] Led by a young peasant of the village of Chanzeaux, René Forêt, the rebels routed the gendarmes and the administrators, seized the strong-box of the district, and made a bonfire of the documents of the administration.

---

[274] Long passages of this report may be seen in Deniau, *op. cit.*, I, 267. De Pressensé echoes impartial history when he writes: "These words of one of the leaders of the Gironde contain the most sincere condemnation of all the measures of the Revolution. They show that the civil war could have been avoided by a loyal practice of the Constitution." E. de Pressensé, *L'Eglise et la Révolution*, p. 9.

On the next day, one of these young people, going to Pin-en-Mauges, a little village in the neighborhood, related the affray of the day before to a peddler of the country, Jacques Cathelineau. The latter was about to knead the bread for his family. Interrupting his work, in a resolute tone he said: "We are lost if we stop there. We must rise up all together and start the war today."

The humble peddler who spoke thus and who, three months later, would be named commander-in-chief of the Vendeans, was a man of tall stature, vigorous body, features full of fire and expression. Said his contemporaries: "His voice was so beautiful that to hear it was a pleasure when he used to sing at the lectern on Sundays or when, at a wedding, he intoned the joyous song that made everyone join in." He was scarcely thirty-four years old.[276] From 1785 to 1793 his frequent journeys throughout the region, where he used to go selling thread, wool, and the various objects of his trade, had made him acquainted in most of the towns and villages. The affability of his manner made him universally well liked. Because of his deep piety he was venerated by all. When religion began to be persecuted, Jacques Cathelineau, not satisfied with praying privately at home, organized pilgrimages to the chief shrines of the neighborhood, notably to Notre-Dame-de-Charité and Notre-Dame-de-Bon-Secours. "At his suggestion the parishes having an intruder as pastor wrapped in black crepe the cross that headed their procession. This mournful sight impressed everyone and added to the horror with which the schism and heresy filled this religious people." [277] His faith was so deep and his humility so great that everyone afterward called him "the Saint of Anjou."

---

[275] Deniau, *op. cit.*, I, 429–31.

The First Vendean Insurgents

On the evening of March 13, Cathelineau had about him twenty-seven young men [278] ready to follow him wherever he would lead them. The impromptu leader decorated his breast with a rosary and a scapular, his men doing the same. The little band went toward Poitevinière, on their way recruiting farm hands, share-croppers, and household servants. Soon they numbered 500, armed only with implements of labor, iron pitchforks, scythes straightened and attached to poles, strong clubs, and a few hunting muskets. Jaillais, Cheuille, and Cholet fell into their hands. The movement spread into the whole Vendée. Soon 3,000 men were under arms. Cathelineau's band grew in its march, some troops raised by a game-keeper, Stofflet, others by a village surgeon, Cady, and others by a tobacco merchant, Perdriau. On March 16, the day following the seizure of Cholet, no nobleman had yet commanded this army three times victorious. But the same day as the victory of Cholet, some insurgents, who had not followed Cathelineau, went to the château of La Baronnière and proclaimed the Marquis de Bonchamp their leader. This former officer of Indian troops had served as a major of the Acquitaine regiment under the command of the bailiff of Suffren and then had abandoned his position rather than take the constitutional oath. Bonchamp was thirty-four years old. The nobility of his heart surpassed that of his ancestry. "Let us fortify ourselves with courage," he said to his young wife as he was leaving her. "Let us lift our thoughts toward heaven; but let us not count on human glory, because civil wars do not give any." [279]

---

[276] Deniau, *Jacques Cathelineau*, 1896.

[277] Charpentier, *Jacques Cathelineau*, 1911, p. 23.

[278] See their names in Deniau, I, 439.

While Bonchamp put himself at the head of the insurgents at Saint-Florent, D'Elbée, yielding to the wishes of those from Beaupreau, willingly became their leader. He was a simple pious man, beloved by the peasants who lived about his modest manor. After him, the people of their districts petitioned two other noblemen, Lescure and La Rochejaquelein, who came with their troops and joined the army of Cathelineau. The first was not yet twenty-seven years old. A former captain in the Royal Piedmont regiment, tall, well-built, of noble appearance, sweet disposition, and admirable piety, he became a perfect example of virtue as well as of courage for the Vendean army. La Rochejaquelein was twenty years old. Blond, with a slender and elegant figure, and of shy bearing, this young man was to be one of the most beloved leaders of the Vendean peasants. Although he seldom ventured to give a word in council, he was always seen in the first line of battle.[280] "My friends," said he to his soldiers when entering his first engagement, "I am nothing more than a child, but I wish, through my courage, to show myself worthy of being your commander. If I advance, follow me; if I fall back, kill me; if I die, avenge me."

---

[279] See Blachez, *Bonchamp et l'insurrection vendéene,* from original documents, 1902.

The combined forces of Cathelineau, Bonchamp, D'Elbée, Lescure, and La Rochejaquelein made up "the Catholic and royal army." It engaged in its first pitched battle at Chemillé on April 11, took Thouars by storm May 5, overwhelming the troops of General Chalbos nine days later at Châtaigneraie, routed the army corps of Leygonier at Concourson of June 5, on June 8 that of General Salomon, and two days later seized Saumer. As they marched into battle, the Vendean army sang hymns. Before beginning to attack, they knelt to receive the priest's blessing. At Châtaigneraie, while under fire from enemy cannon, Lescure's soldiers noticed a mission cross; they fell to their knees, sustaining grapeshot fearlessly. One of their leaders desired to start moving. "Let them pray," said Lescure; "they will only fight better." They got up as a result full of courage and dislodged the enemy from their positions. From every side new recruits flocked in with a rosary in their buttonholes and a scapular over their hearts. "The like of this has not been seen since the Crusades," wrote Barère to the Convention.

Cathelineau

Until then all the plans of the campaign had been settled in council under the moral influence of Cathelineau. On June 12, Bonchamp, D' Elbée, Lescure, La Rochejaquelein, Stofflet, all the corps leaders elected by unanimous vote as supreme general of the Vendean army the man whose influence had impressed itself on all.[281] Cathelineau was not only the one leader who knew better the habits of the Vendean soldiers and the topography of the country where they fought; he also revealed the highest qualities of a soldier: the swiftness of his glance, his skill in maneuvers, the sureness of his advice, placed him over the men whom he commanded.

---

[280] Deniau, *op. cit.*, I, 625. Cf. *Henri de La Rochejaquelein et la guerre de la Vendée*, 1890.

While the army of Cathelineau fought in the Vendean area which is called Le Bocage, marked with hills and streams, with thorny hedges and hollows, another army fought in the flat and open country called Le Marais. The small farms there were protected by muddy swamps which were jumped over with the aid of long poles and planks hard to carry. The man who commanded the insurgents from the swamp lands was Charette. François Charette de la Contrie was not yet thirty years of age, "in no way resembling the leaders of Anjou and Upper Poitou; he was a man of easy morals; the dazzling extravagance of his dress was something theatrical; but his penetrating gaze, tight lips, and clear sharp voice showed the leader who intended to be obeyed and would be. Besides, as brave a soldier as he was a clever tactician and adroit politician, he was truly worthy of command." [282]

In June, Charette and Cathelineau combined their efforts. For the first time the wealthy and the lowly Vendeans cooperated in the same campaign. The objective was seizure of the city of Nantes, whose fall would deliver Brittany and Normandy. On June 29, while Charette, D'Elbée, Bonchamp, and the other leaders directed the attack on seven different points, Cathelineau assaulted the gates of Rennes, where after a long battle he rushed forward at the head of a devoted band of 300 men. Braving heavy fire, he had already reached the Viarme and saw that the enemy was disturbed. A bullet broke his arm and pierced his chest. All was over. He fell. His Vendeans thought only of carrying him away and fought only to retreat. Carried to Saint-Florent, the wounded general continued to issue orders to his army, but gangrene set in, and, on July 14,[283] Jacques Cathelineau died praising God. Four months had sufficed to cover his name with immortal glory. Undoubtedly in his army and especially near his army, more than one crime was committed unworthy of the noble cause he had served. Because of the intrigue of the tax-collector Souchu, who later sought to betray the Vendeans, 500 people were hatefully massacred after the capture of Machecoul. Equally deplorable deeds took place in half a score of localities.[284] But if we must stigmatize these crimes, we should also stigmatize the crimes of the revolutionary demagogue. Justice obliges us to declare that the glory of Cathelineau remained entirely free from these excesses. "Meek, modest," comments a historian devoted to the Revolution, "a true countryman with an unpretending sincere heart, uninterested in mean political passion, he had that composure which overawed and that enthusiasm which spoke to the soul of soldiers." [285] He had that deep and living faith which gained for him the surname of Saint of Anjou.

---

[281] Bossard, *Cathelineau, generalissime de la grande armée catholique et royale,* 1893.

[282] Veuillot, *Guerres de la Vendée et de la Bretagne,* 3rd ed., p. 55. See Napoleon's appreciation of Carette in *Memoirs of the Life, Exile, and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon,* IV, 89. Cf. Bittard des Portes, *Charette et la guerre de la Vendée.*

His death was a major blow to the Vendean cause. As a result, wrote one of the historians of the Vendée, "as long as Cathelineau lived, the principal driving force of the fighting army of the Vendée was kept together by the words and example of this man of faith. That was the period of successive progress for the Catholic and royal cause; God blessed it. But from the time of the death of this saint of Anjou, when nobles became almost the exclusive masters in the direction of its affairs and gradually substituted the political element for its pious program, reverses followed. God withdrew His favors in proportion to the forgetfulness that they showed Him. From all reports, the death of Cathelineau was therefore a disaster for the Vendée."[286]

---

[283] Most historians fix the date of Cathelineau's death as July 14, 1793; a few the 19th. Célestin Port, member of the Institute, archivist of Maine-et-Loire, thinks he can fix the date as July 4. Port, *Dictionnaire historique de Maine-et-Loire,* s. v. Cathelineau. Deniau holds the date to be July 14 (Deniau, II, 277).

[284] Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur,* VI, 269–72.

[285] Port, *loc. cit.*

The Second Period

We are not here concerned with relating in detail the military phases of the Vendean and Brittany campaign during this second period, which had no lack of noble feats of arms and virtuous heroic acts; but, all in all, the glory of this period is less clear: division gained admission and became more pronounced among the leaders of the Vendean army; less noble sentiments prevailed; suspect men mixed their intrigues and passions in defense of the great Catholic cause.

On the first of August the Convention drew up a decree of savage extermination: "All kinds of combustible substances will be sent to the Vendée to set fire to the woods, brushwood, and broom plants. The forests will be razed, the haunts of the rebels will be destroyed, the harvest will be rooted up by companies of workmen, and the cattle seized."[287] Ten days later 18,000 men from the garrison which had just capitulated in Mainz, and from the garrisons of Condé and Valenciennes, were sent into the West. In all, 100,000 armed men were in the Vendée with the watchword the convention had given them: "We must make the Terror the order of the day." Under the leadership of D'Elbée, who had been elected commander-in-chief replacing Cathelineau, the Catholic army, irritated and impatient, answered violence with violence. Hardly any more prisoners were taken by either side. At last, on October 18, the Vendean army was defeated at Cholet. Bonchamp and Lescure were mortally wounded. Pocketed at the Loire were 80,000 men, women, and children, half-mad, without supplies. A dreadful thought struck the enraged mob, that of killing five thousand Republican prisoners whom it had not thought of taking along with it on the right bank of the river. But the dying Bonchamp heard the furious shouts of the multitude. His failing powers revived: "Spare these unfortunates," said he to those who gathered round him; "this is surely the last order that I shall issue to you; give me the assurance that it will be carried out." At these words, the attendants of the Christian hero, moved even to tears, broke out into the crowd crying: "Mercy! Mercy! Bonchamp wishes it." The Republican prisoners were set at liberty, and the crowd crossed the Loire on half a score of boats. La Rochejaquelein, elected generalissimo, reawakened new ardor in the Vendean army. On October 23, after a furious assault, he made himself master of Laval.

---

[286] Deniau, *Histoire de la Vendée,* II, 233.

[287] *Moniteur,* August 2, 1793, p. 914.

It was at Laval that the great Vendean army met the Chouans from Brittany. Since August 15, 1792, when Jean Chouan had made his first attack with a makeshift troop, other bands of rebels had formed. In addition to the Misdon wood, situated seven miles from Laval and having become the general headquarters of Jean Chouan and his brothers, the woods of the Gravelle, the forests of Fougères, of Pertre and Lorge, became populated with armed revolutionaries. A former cavalry officer, the Count of Puisaye, had organized these different bands. Word of the battle given to Laval warned the Chouans of the presence of the Vendeans. Five to six thousand Breton peasants and manor tenants were joined to the large army of La Rochejaquelein. They took part thereafter in all its battles, its glories, and its defeats. They were singled out by their long hair and their clothes, for the most part the untrimmed hides of goats.

But the generals recently sent to combat the uprising were warriors of great bravery: Kleber, Westermann, Vimeux, and Marceau. On the other hand division had begun in the Vendean army. After the victory at Laval its leaders hesitated on what to do. La Rochejaquelein favored a triumphant return to Poitou; but Talmont suggested marching on Paris and defended his plan tenaciously; some others wished to invade Brittany and enter Normandy. Time was lost in these fatal discussions. Soldiers and people no longer had that unlimited confidence in their leaders which they had given them at the beginning of the campaign. As a matter of fact many among them were baffled by the strangeness of their leaders' attitude.

From May 5, the date of the seizure of Thouars, the Catholic army had in its midst a priest who had presented himself to the Vendean leaders as a prelate sent by Pope Pius VI. He took the title of Bishop of Agara *in partibus,* officiating pontifically on feast days before the throng, exercising unquestioned authority on them by the prestige of his reputation. He was formerly pastor of Dol, named Guyot de Folleville. At last it was discovered that his behavior ill justified the honorary distinctions and confidential missions that he had taken on himself. A papal brief dated July 3, 1793 and addressed to the leaders of the Vendean army, unmasked his deceit. "We advise you," said Pius VI, "to shun this man as an impostor who is stained with sacrilege and to nullify all acts of jurisdiction which he ventured to make." Guyot de Folleville was obliged to refrain henceforth from all episcopal acts. Yet he stayed in the army. He was killed at Angers, February 5, 1794. Another priest of superior worth, whom we shall see in the Consulate under Bonaparte, played a considerable role, Father Bernier, taking part on the side of the pretended bishop of Agra in the planning of the higher council of the army. This son of a simple peasant, while still very young, on the mere strength of his merit, had obtained one of the chief pastorates of Angers. Father Bernier exercised almost limitless influence on the peasants. His activity was ceaseless, but his conduct was too often prompted by wholly human considerations,[288] and his plans were not always the best. He was the one who suggested the creation of assignats[289] like those of the Republic in order to get some money for himself. His colleagues on the higher council proved their sense of honor by refusing to issue such spurious currency. The decree of proscription against men who served the Republic and against their families, and the obligation imposed on Republicans staying in the Vendée, of giving an oath of fidelity to Louis XVII were measures of Bernier's initiative. Along with a historian of the Vendean campaign, we may make a threefold condemnation of such measures, that of injustice, untimeliness, and weakness.[290]

The check of the Vendean army before Angers and its defeat at Le Mans accentuated the discouragement. They found themselves reduced to a mere 45,000 combatants. The failure of one attempt that had been made to cross the Loire added to their confusion. Nevertheless their faith in God remained steadfast in these well-tempered souls and outlived all deceit and dissension. One day two Vendean horsemen got ready to settle their quarrel in the lists, sword in hand. A man came by and said to them: "Christ pardoned His executioners; and you, a soldier of the Christian army, wish to kill your comrade." They embraced each other. Their faith in the King, who seemed to these men the only defense of the religious cause, was never again shaken. The cry of "Long live the King" always accompanied the cry "Long live religion," when the soldier of the Catholic army entered battle or when he fell mortally wounded in the fray. But the confidence of the country folk in regard to the noblemen who directed the war had obviously sunk. Attacked and surrounded at Savenay, their last refuge, by the veteran troops of Kleber, Westermann, and Marceau, the remains of the Vendean army was not only defeated but wiped out. Only the women and a few fugitives barely succeeded in escaping by way of Guérande. Westermann wrote: "Everywhere only the grim reaper is to be seen: in the environs of Savenay alone more than 6,000 bodies have been buried." This was December 23, 1793.

---

[288] "His good qualities," says Deniau, "were dimmed by an inordinate ambition, an insatiable desire to govern all, and a relish for sowing discord" (Deniau, II, 114).

[289] French paper money issued by the Republic, 1789–97.

[290] Veuillot, *Guerres de la Vendée et de la Bretagne,* p. 137. The decree which required Republicans to take an oath to Louis XVII was soon abolished for it ended only in the commission of perjury.

"The great Catholic royalist army had perished, enshrouded in its victories and defeats; but it had saved the honor of Christian France and, in spite of the inherent weakness of human nature, was left to teach and recall by its struggle the noblest examples of heroism, uprightness, and faith."[291] These examples lived again subsequently in campaigns by Charette and La Rochejaquelein in the Vendée, and in Brittany by Cadoudal, hereafter at the head of independent troops. The Convention ended by compromising with them and granting freedom of Catholic worship to Brittany and the Vendée.

The Other Provinces

If, as in the time of the League, the insurrection had been able to carry all France, the Revolution, at least in its antireligious action, would have been crushed. Perhaps, too, this result might have ensued if one of the princes, so ardently asked for and vainly awaited by the combatants in the West, had come as had the princes of Guise for the League in the sixteenth century to command the insurrection. The regions where religious faith was less profound or less widespread were able merely to harass here and there. The regions from Bordeaux to Toulon and from Lyons to Marseilles had a few partial uprisings which were at once strenuously repressed. But the persecutors, wherever they tried to force Christians to renounce their faith and disobey their legitimate leaders, met a heroic resistance which was worthy of the first centuries of Christianity. We cannot cite every example. Church history, however, cannot pass over in silence the martyrdom of those whom perhaps one day the Church will number among its saints. In the first rank must be placed Father Noël Pinot, put to death for the faith in the public square of Angers, February 21, 1794; Sister Marguerite Rutan, of the Daughters of Charity, executed at Dax on April 9; the thirty-two nuns guillotined at Orange between the 6th and 26th of July; and the Blessed Carmelites of Compiègne whom the Church already commemorates on July 17, the anniversary of the date of their death.

---

[291] Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise catholique en France*, XX, 146.

On the afternoon of February 21, 1794, the population of Angers witnessed a sight unique perhaps in the annals of Christianity. A priest clothed in his sacerdotal vestments, cassock, alb, stole, and chasuble, crossed the city with his hands tied behind his back, escorted by guards and soldiers. Led by a drum, the grim procession went to the Place du Ralliement; there a scaffold was erected on the very spot where the high altar of Saint Pierre had been. This priest's name was Noël Pinot, since 1788 pastor of the parish of Louroux-Béconnais, on the banks of the Loire. Arrested March 4, 1791, for having declared from the pulpit that "he would never submit to laws enacted by the assembly on spiritual matters, even when he saw the punishment prepared for him," he had been, in accordance with the decree of September 27, 1790, adjudged stripped of his rights as an active citizen and incapable of fulfilling any public function. Yet nothing had diminished the zeal of this true pastor. Since then, hunted as a criminal, spending his days in attics and stables where he slept as he could, devoting his nights to covering the many miles and the three villages of his parish, hearing confessions, preaching, administering the sacraments, celebrating Mass in secret, changing the place of his hideout frequently in order not to compromise the courageous peasants who sheltered him, always alert for the agents of the National Guard and the searching parties, the courageous pastor of Louroux was betrayed by malcontents whom he had supported with his alms. He was arrested in the village of La Milanderie in the home of a pious widow when he was about to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice. Father Gruget who was an eyewitness relates that his judges, in order to add more pomp to his punishment, asked him if he would prefer to go there in his priestly vestments. "Yes," he replied, "that would be a great consolation to me." "Very well," his executioners answered, "you will be clothed in them and be put to death in this attire." [292]

Having come to the scaffold, the moment he placed his foot on the bottom step the saintly priest had a sublime inspiration. The sight of the priestly vestments which he wore reminded him of the Sacrifice of the Mass, in its mystic sense so like that which he was going to offer. Raising his eyes to heaven he exclaimed, *Introibo ad altare Dei* ("I will go to the altar of God"). At these words, the members of the military commission which had condemned him shouted out, "Long live the Republic!" which was the usual signal for the execution. The priest allowed himself to be fastened to the fatal board, and the knife fell. Father Noël Pinot had been a priest until the last.

Sister Marguerite Rutan, who died on the scaffold at Dax in Les Landes two months later (April 9), was also able to give testimony that she had been a Daughter of Charity to the end. Born at Metz in 1736, this humble daughter of St. Vincent de Paul, after many assignments in the service of the poor, was employed at the hospital in Dax when the decree of August 18, 1792, appeared suppressing "all religious congregations even those devoted solely to hospital work." Sister Rutan, spreading her spirit of determination to her companions, then organized them into an association of "The Ladies of Charity" in which the rules of the religious life were observed as well as the members were able. But her energetic refusal to take the constitutional oath which they wished to force on her under penalty of exclusion from the hospital, focused the attention of the committee of vigilance on her. She was accused, arrested, and condemned to death "as having by her lack of patriotism attempted to corrupt and diminish the revolutionary spirit, and as such was unworthy of fulfilling humane and charitable offices that are due free men."

---

[292] Marquis de Ségur and C. Sauvé, *Un admirable martyr sous la Terreur,* 1904, p. 153; Uzureau, *Noël Pinot,* 1912.

An eyewitness tells us that, while Sister Marguerite Rutan and the stubborn priest Jean Eutrope de Lannelongue were [293] led to the guillotine in double time and with the roll of the drum, "one of the children that the sister had seen playing in the hospital cast a curious glance into the street from the room where he found himself shut up. His eyes met those of the martyr, who smiled up at him tenderly. The child's mother was near him and in a feeling of horror she shut the window quickly and said to her son: "Fall on your knees and pray for her; the wicked men are going to kill her." The child fell into tears.[294] The biographer of Marguerite Rutan does not hesitate to say that this holy daughter of St. Vincent de Paul was truly a martyr in the most exact sense of the word.

The thirty-two sisters put to death at Orange (July 6–26,

---

[293] Father de Lannelongue, a heroic priest, exercised his ministry at the risk of his life, still wearing the dress of a peasant as he was dressed when he was arrested.

[294] Coste, *Une victime de la Révolution, Sœur Marguerite Rutan,* 1904. We can also mention the four Daughters of Charity of Arras, guillotined at Cambrai by order of Le Bon. They were declared Venerable by Pius X.

1794) were martyrs, too. Of these thirty-two nuns, twenty-nine had been born at Bollène, a little town in Comtat Venaissin. They were members of two religious communities, the Sacramentines and the Ursulines. The peaceful, delightful city lamented the loss of the kindly and fatherly government of the pope. This fact was known at Avignon and even at Paris. A delegate of the Convention, the terrible Maignet, called the "executioner of the Midi," vowed that he would "chop off the heads of the proud who had not been able to humble themselves before the level of equality." He carried it out to the letter. The Sacramentines and Ursulines, expelled from their convents on October 13, endeavored to preserve the practice of the religious life in their relatives' homes or in a rented house. There the warrants for their arrest were served on each of them. On May 1, twenty-eight Sacramentines under the direction of their superior (Madame de La Fare, sister of the Bishop of Nancy) and four Ursulines who acknowledged as their mother Madame de Troquart climbed up into their carts and were led to Orange. "Poor victims led to slaughter," cried out one of the men in the crowd before the spectacle; for his outburst he was seized and led away with them. "Their wonderful piety in prison," writes one of their historians," their joyfulness at the call of the tribunal, and their stately appearance before their judges and executioners made these thirty-two religious apostles and angels of consolation in the midst of the prisoners." [295] "Arriving at the scene of their triumph," we read in the *Relations* of 1795, "they embraced the scaffold, thanked their judges, pardoned their executioners, and with peace in their hearts and a look of serenity on their faces consummated their sacrifice." The spectators murmured: "Religion alone could inspire so much courage and assurance." [296]

---

[295] Cherot, *Figures de martyrs,* 1907, p. 147.

[296] Redon, *Trente-deux religieuses guillotinées à Orange en 1794* (1904), p. 105. At Valenciennes, eleven Ursulines were also led to the scaffold. Their cause has been introduced at Rome.

We are told that the religious of Bollène sang hymns while on their way to death. On July 17 Paris witnessed a scene no less touching. Sixteen Carmelite nuns from the convent of Compiègne with their hands tied behind their backs standing in the carts which the populace called "rolling graves," slowly crossed the city to the Palace of Justice where they had been condemned to death, and to the Place du Trone where they were executed. All sang. The streets which had so often echoed revolutionary songs sounded with the Psalmody of the *Miserere* and the *Salve Regina.* Here and there a few savage murmurs were heard, but on almost the entire length of the route the innocent victims were greeted by the respectful silence of the people who listened to them, having been won over by this new harmony. They ended with the *Veni Creator* and renewed aloud their baptismal promises and religious vows.

Of all the victims of the Revolution we note but few whose character of "martyrs of the faith" rests on such convincing proof. A decree of the committee of vigilance at Compiègne, dated June 21, 1794, had denounced them as "always living subject to the fanatical regulations of their cloister." [297] We know what the word "fanatical" meant on the lips of the terrorists. At the height of the trial, the public prosecutor, after presenting other motives, returned to this accusation of fanaticism. One of the religious had the presence of mind to ask for an explanation of the word. After a torrent of insults, driven to extremes the prosecutor answered: "By fanaticism I mean your adherence to childlike belief, your silly practice of religion." "My dear Mother and Sisters," replied the valiant nun, while turning toward her companions, "you have heard the prosecutor declare that it is for our attachment to religion. . . . O how fortunate! How fortunate are we to die for God!" [298]

---

[297] For the text of the decree, see Sorel, *Carmélites de Compiègne* (1878), p. 27.

[298] Pierre, *Seize Carmélites de Compiègne,* p. 144.

Having arrived at the foot of the scaffold, the prioress, Marie Thérèse de Saint Augustin, asked for the grace of dying last. "The youngest, Constance Meunier, novice since 1789, fell on her knees before her spiritual mother, receiving from her lips the words of blessing, and then as she would have done in the convent, asked for one last favor, the permission of dying. Then she separated from them, climbed the ladder, and presented herself to the executioner. Thus each in turn, accompanied by the chant, which kept growing weaker, the other nuns down to the mother prioress, who like the mother of the Machabees, went up last, assured of the faith of her daughters with whom she was reunited in death." [299]

While faith elevated the souls of the victims to these heavenly heights, in striking contrast the spirit of evil made those of the persecutors descend to the extremes of vileness. Of these none perhaps was more hideous than Jean Baptiste Carrier. In him, following an expression of Taine, Jacobin fury had reached "its extreme." [300] "A tall, lean man," writes Michelet, "of swarthy complexion, awkward in his walk, with sham gestures, restless eyes, bewildered and misguided, he should have been ridiculed, but he was feared." [301] Carrier's moral side was even below the physical. "This man never had a mind," writes Lamartine, "but a depraved instinct. He never had a single idea except fury. Murder was his only philosophy; blood his sole pleasure." [302] "With Carrier as with a mad dog," says Taine, "his brain was completely filled with recurring diabolical thoughts, with never-ending images of murder and death." [303] This terrorist operated at Nantes. The guillotine and the firing squad were not enough for him. One day Carrier, who chose his underlings from the most despicable dregs of the people, called upon some barge-men as ruthless as himself. He ordered them to open the sea cocks of a certain number of ships. One of the barge-men asked him for a written order. "Am I not an official?" Carrier answered him. "It is not so mysterious," he added. "You will be loaded with fifty priests and you will let them fall in the water in the midst of the current." The next day he wrote to the Convention that fifty priests had perished by a "new torture." The drownings at Nantes continued for several months. Carrier often took pleasure in riding on these same ships. While he thus had a joyful time with his drinking companions, a stifled groaning informed him that the victims were drowning under his feet; and he continued his drunken bout.[304]

---

[299] Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

[300] Taine, *Les origines*, VII, 341.

[301] Michelet, *Histoire de la Révolution*, VII, 81. Compare this description with the portrait given by Lenôtre in his book, *Les noyades de Nantes*.

[302] Lamartine, *Histoire des Girondins*, Bk. LIII; Le Chevalier, *op. cit.*, III, 281.

[303] Taine, *op. cit.*, VII, 340.

Somewhat like this monster were Le Bon at Arras, Collot d'Herbois at Lyons, Maignet in the Comtat Venaissin, Tallien at Bordeaux, Robespierre le Jeune at Vesul, Saint-Just in Alsace, and Fouquier-Tinville at Paris who took part in so many massacres that more than one grew pale when, at the end of so many crimes, they caught a glimpse of some inevitable punishment. Their victims, on the contrary, at the moment of their execution, thrilled with expectation. "Dear God," cried out one of sixteen Carmelites at the foot of the scaffold, "I would be only too happy if this small sacrifice of my life would appease Thy anger and lessen the number of victims." [305] Eleven days later on July 28, 1794, Robespierre and twenty-two of his accomplices were led to the scaffold. The next day sixty-two members of the Commune were executed. The Reign of Terror was over.

The Vendée and Brittany

From the religious viewpoint, the two chief results of the uprising which had just been effected were the conclusion of the Treaty of La Jaunais with the Vendean leaders and the reopening of a large number of churches.

---

[304] On Carrier, see Lenôtre, *op. cit.*

[305] Jauffret, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Révolution,* II, 353.

That the resistance of the Vendée might be ended, the commander-in-chief of the Republican troops in the Vendée, Turreau, formerly Baron of Garambouville, had organized there, since January 20, 1794, twelve mobile columns, called "infernal columns," with orders to burn whatever could be burned.[306] But the result had to be awaited. In spite of the regrettable divisions that had arisen among the Vendean leaders, the 400,000 souls still [307] remaining in the Vendée proved themselves to be irreducible. In April the Convention impatiently gave Turreau a month to finish the undertaking,[308] which ended by an understanding, especially after the death of Robespierre, that violence and terror never had any effect on the souls of the Vendeans and Bretons, as firm as the granite on which they stood. They began by speaking of forgetting grievances, of harmony. The offer which the Vendeans themselves had made to the government was rejected until the 9th of Thermidor brought matters to an end. General Hoche, placed at the head of the troops of the West, made great efforts to prevent all plunder. Liberty of worship was in a way the basis. He said: "Rebuild your cottages, pray to God as if you mean it and work in your fields." A perspicacious and understanding man, Hoche joined to his talents of generalship a genuine ability to govern. This new policy succeeded in the country. Many priests, no longer considering the cause of the Church bound to the cause of the monarchy, recommended submission to the government. Toward the end of 1795 most of the peasants, without treating Charette as an enemy, refused to serve him, and maintained scrupulous neutrality. On December 2, 1794, Carnot, as member of the Committee of Public Safety, proposed the following decree and had it adopted by the Convention: "All people known in the districts of the West, on the shores of Brest and Cherbourg, by the name of rebels of the Vendée or Chouans, who lay down their arms within the month following the day of publication of the present decree will neither be molested nor be investigated in the future for taking part in their rebellion."

---

[306] See his order of the day to General Huché, dated 2nd Ventôse, in Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

[307] This is the appraisal given by the Conventionist Lequinio. *Ibid.*, p. 268.

[308] *Ibid.*, p. 293.

On all sides minds were prepared for peace. On February 17, 1795, eleven members of the National Convention on one hand and twenty Vendean officers on the other signed a treaty at La Jaunais near Nantes. The first three articles of the treaty are the following: "Article 1: Every individual and all sections of citizens whatever are able freely and peaceably to exercise their religion. Article 2: Individuals and ministers of all creeds whatever will not be troubled, disturbed or investigated for the free exercise, peaceful and internal, of their religion. Article 3: Civil authorities and commanders of the army are charged with taking the execution of the present treaty in hand." Breton and Vendean blood had not been shed in vain.

"Just as the fall of Robespierre had led the Republic to the notion of humanity from which the Vendée benefited, in like manner the religious liberty granted to it would lead the Republic finally to grant liberty of religion to the nation, not only in principle but in reality."[309] Louis Veuillot could write: "The resistance of the Vendée was not a mere episode in the vast, tragic picture of the fall of the old monarchy; it was the only action which had counterbalanced, for the future of French society, the victorious events of the Revolution. Royalty, nobility, institutions, laws, and distinctions of dress had all succumbed. That which the Vendée had protected especially, that which had put armed forces in its hands, never was lost. The Vendean fought for the cross."[310]

[309] Brugere, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise*, p. 1135.

[310] Quoted by Eugene Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

The revolution had not in reality brought the immediate cessation of the persecution against priests. "Two months after the fall of Robespierre some priests accused of emigration were even guillotined at Paris. These were the priests last released from prison. On the margin of one writ of liberation we read these words: "Postponed since he is a priest." [311] Moderates and Jacobins found themselves in accord when the question concerned religious matters. The clearly voiced will of the rural population was in favor of the re-establishment of worship, a will manifest not only in the West, but even in part of Normandy, in the sections of the central Massif in Franche-Comté and in some parts of the Midi, which exerted the first wholesome pressure on legislation. The Treaty of La Jaunais brought the movement to a close. "The Convention," as Aulard declares, "noted that the people were always Catholic, and loudly demanded the realization of the decree on liberty of worship. The Revolution had been able neither to assimilate Catholicism nor to destroy it, but had to resign itself to living side by side with it, considering religions as peculiar societies, which had the right to exist under law without interference from the state, which remained secular." [312] Such indeed were the thoughts that inspired the law of February 21, 1795, on the freedom of worship and that of May 30 on the reopening of non-alienated churches.

"In conformity with article 7 of the Declaration of the Rights of Man," reads the first article of February's law, "the practice of any cult cannot be disturbed." The truth is that the nine articles following this one are applied to restrict the expressing of this liberty of worship. Thus article 5 forbade "appearing in public in the dress, decoration, or costume appropriate to religious ceremonies"; article 3 forbade to communities "all purchase or renting of a place for the practice of religion"; and article 9 forbade "the making of any endowment, perpetual or for life, and the establishment of any tax to pay its expenses." [313] May's law determined that "citizens of communes or sections of a commune provisionally had the free use of buildings not alienated, originally intended for the exercise of worship" (art. 1). "When citizens of the same commune or of the same section practice different religions, their place of worship will be common," each religion will have days and hours fixed by the municipality (art. 4). "No one, however, will be permitted to exercise the ministry of any religion in these aforesaid buildings without having made an act of submission to the laws of the Republic" (art. 5).[314]

---

[311] Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris de la Révolution,* II, 153. Father Emery, superior of St. Sulpice, was not freed until October 25, 1795, and Father Duclaud, his future successor, remained in prison until January, 1795.

[312] Aulard, *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française,* II, 139.

Under what conditions did the "citizens of communes or sections of communes" obtain the free use of their former churches not alienated? The answer to this question allows almost as many distinctions as existed in the matter of opening churches.[315] This condition was seen at Paris in the parish of St. Roch where the pastor, Father Marduel, exclusively managed all the financial administration of the parish through himself or his curate; but elsewhere the secular element interfered. At St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Eustache, St. Lawrence, St. Jacques du Haut-Pas, St. Etienne-du-Mont, societies of worship were formed which took the temporal administration of the parish into their hands, displaying a true zeal in the repair of churches, the purchase of objects necessary for worship, the maintenance of the ministers and officers, but sometimes exceeding the limits of canon law by their excessive meddling in parochial government.[316]

---

[313] *Bulletin des lois.* III, no. 665.

[314] *Ibid.*, IV, no. 150.

[315] J. Grente, *Le culte catholique à Paris de la Terreur au Concordat* (Paris, 1903), p. 20.

[316] Grente, *op. cit.*, pp. 21–24; Victor Pierre, *L'Eglise Saint-Thomas d'Aquin pendant la Révolution;* L. Soutif, "Une société du culte catholique à Paris pendant la

In the early months of 1795, many constitutional priests retracted their errors and returned to the Church. At Paris the vicars general of De Juigné received a large number of these recantations.[317] The movement was no less marked in the provinces. Every place saw priests abjuring the schism, as the newspapers of the time attest.[318] The large number of retractions is admitted by the constitutionalists themselves in their paper. It is the subject of more than ordinary derision and complaints to be found on each page. They treat the priests who abjured the schism as cowards and self-seekers.[319] Unquestionably the conduct of those who retracted at once after the papal condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, when the government reserved its favors for those alone who took the oath, was otherwise heroic. Now the state abandoned the constitutional clergy to the common law, concurring with the Catholics loyal to the Pope. Members of the constitutional clergy whined bitterly over this situation. One anonymous petitioner declared that the law of February 21, 1795, made any religion impossible for "lack of a place of worship, lack of ministers, and lack of funds." [320] Father Adrien declared: "Your decree of February too greatly favors the non-jurors who preach royalism; it has too little protection for Republican priests." [321] The behavior of the retractants was nevertheless most meritorious because the Church, before again admitting them into the body of the hierarchy, maintained steadfastly the observance of the

---

première séparation," excerpt from *La Revue des questions historiques*, 1908; A. Mathiez, "L'exercise du culte sous la première séparation," from the *Revue politique et parlementaire* of January 10, 1907.

[317] Michel Priot, in his *Mémoires,* declares that he read the long list of these retractations in a special register preserved by the Archbishop of Paris. This register was lost in the destruction of 1830. Priot noted among the names of the retractors those of the two episcopal vicars of Gobel: Gerard and Mille. Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 132.

[318] See the *Annales de l' Abbé de Boulogne,* III, 255.

[319] *Annales de la religion,* II, 597; IV, 121, 145; Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 433.

[320] Quoted by Gazier, *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* p. 258.

[321] *Ibid.*

severe tests which the Pope exacted from the priests who had taken the oath.[322] Required of them were public abjuration, abdication of the usurped parish, penance proportionate to the scandal given, restitution of ecclesiastical goods unduly collected, and other conditions. The retractant also ran the risk of encouraging the dislike of administrative authorities, who on the whole remained favorable to the constitutional Church and especially continued to hate the Roman Church.

We have no need, in fact, to exaggerate the improvement brought about in the situation of the Catholic clergy by the revolution of July 27 (9 Thermidor). The July reaction was more a political reaction than a religious one. Those same ones who triumphed could not be of great assistance to the Church. The reaction personified itself and showed especially in these "golden youth" made up of Girondin and royalist young men dressed in the fashion of dandies and wearing the green cape of the Breton Chouans. They soon made themselves masters of the streets of Paris. They indulged in festive gatherings at the Palais Royal, in the salons of Madame Tallien and Madame de Staël, leaving these gatherings to attack the Jacobins in their clubs with blows of their canes and making the streets resound with revengeful songs.

The tardy day of vengeance
At length makes hangmen pale.

At the theater they applauded these lines of Mahomet:

Wipe out, great God, from the earth where we are
Whoever with joy pours forth men's blood.

This was the time when the *émigré* princess, the Count d'Artois, the Count of Provence, and the Prince de Condé, wondered if the moment had not come to re-establish the royalty and abolish the entire work of the Revolution. Paul Thureau-Dangin in his important work on the days following July 29 tells of the series of projects, conferences, and intrigues that had led up to the proclamation of Verona and the unfortunate expedition of Quiberon.[323]

---

[322] See the briefs of Pius V of April 13, 1791, and June 13, 1792; Hulot, *Collectio brevium Pii VI*, pp. 223, 270, 315, 329, etc.

The Church could not be expected to give its approval to a frivolous and skeptical society, which fought the results of the Revolution while perpetuating its profound causes. The clearest consequences of the July reaction was the provoking of reprisals against the clergy. In the session of April 14, 1795, Rewbell called for a redoubling of persecution against priests "who were not contented with saying Mass in church, but who wished to make France a new Vendée." "We need not persecute priests as priests," he declared, "but as seditious men, as apostles of royalism."[324] On September 22 Marie Joseph Chénier, in an account abounding with attacks on the Jacobins and the Catholics, proposed the institution of civil feasts and, on 17 Pluviôse, Escasseriaux indicated the spirit of these feasts where "men of all creeds would meet to celebrate the Supreme Being, listen to charming addresses on patriotism, and forget the illusions of fanaticism." Chénier's proposal did not pass. Just when it was going to be passed by acclamation, an unexpected opponent appeared on the rostrum. "If you were in good faith," he exclaimed, "you would admit that your clearly evident purpose is to destroy Catholicism."[325] And then, to deny the supposed alliance of the Church with royalty, the orator made an effort to show the joint solidarity of Catholicism with the Republic. In this refutation of a false allegation the speaker fell into a manifest error. The assembly went on scornfully to the order of the day. Chénier's proposal would be taken up later and it would triumph.

---

[323] P. Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et républicans* (the question of monarchy or republic from July 27 to November 11), pp. 3–67.

[324] *Moniteur* of April 17, 1795, p. 846.

[325] This speaker was Grégoire. Gazier, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* pp. 242–44, 341–65.

A law of November 20 affected the use of priests' rectories (not yet sold) for school purposes. On February 2 Lecointre asked the Convention to sell all the rectories and churches. The purpose appeared more and more in evidence: in place of the dispossessed clergy to install, as a new kind of pastor, the teachers, appointed guardians of a new orthodoxy. The project about public education, reported on November 20, 1795, by Lakanal, would, according to the intentions of its authors, "exercise an influence on the spread of knowledge and the destruction of prejudices."[326]

The Constitutional Church (1795)

These trials, which came from the enemies of all belief, were increased for the Church by more intimate afflictions, occasioned by the obstinate schism of the constitutional priests and by the revival of the discussions among loyal Catholics with respect to the last formula of the oath.

In the spring of 1795 the constitutional Church was in a state of decay. "Of the eighty-two bishops holding their sees in 1792, ten were dead, six of them on the scaffold; twenty-four had apostatized, of whom six had attempted marriage; twenty-four had renounced their ecclesiastical functions; twenty-four had fled almost untouched by the crisis, or if they had given up their ecclesiastical titles, this move was only after a long and depressing imprisonment. In every case, these rare survivors of the wreck, scattered, discouraged, abandoned by their priests, scorned by the faithful, systematically ignored by the civil authorities, still trembled at the thought that the Terror might start over again.[327] The law of July, in establishing freedom of worship and in virtually abolishing as a consequence the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, seemed to have inflicted a death sentence on the constitutional Church.[328] This effect would have been the final blow but for the energy of Grégoire.

---

[326] Aulard, *Histoire politique de la Révolution,* p. 535. Cf. Albert Duruy, *L'instruction publique et la Révolution;* A. Perrin, "Quelques grands ancêtres de nos manuels scolaires," in the *Revue pratique d'apologetique* of July 15, 1911. Cf. the anonymous work published in 1817, the *Génie de la Révolution considéré dans l'éducation* (*Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'instruction publique*), 1789, by the author of the *Itinéraire de Buonaparte.* This work has for its author Jean Baptiste Fabry (1780–1821), founder in 1805 of the *Spectateur français.*

A certain historian whom we like to quote here because he had under his eyes all the papers of the Bishop of Loir-et-Cher, says:

> Grégoire appeared in the midst of these drole figures as great because of the dignified attitude he had taken during the Reign of Terror. His merits might be called into question, he might be criticized for having been a slave to his prejudices and grudges and for not having preserved in the presentation of his ideas the calmness and impartiality which are a safeguard against exaggeration and injustice. He might well be called upon for a strict accounting of the stubbornness with which he defended false and dangerous opinions until the end; but it is not less certain that in 1795 he was the man who personified, if not religion, at least the constitutional party and who, having shown great courage at the moment when so many others rivaled one another in cowardice, he was the only one who seemed able to restore his Church, if it could be restored.[329]

Grégoire devoted himself to his work with tireless perseverance. During the winter of 1794 he gathered about him four of his colleagues: Royer from l'Ain, Saurine from Les Landes, Gratien from the Seine-Inférieure, and Desbois from La

---

[327] Pisani, II, 190.

[328] Aulard denies that the Civil Constitution was abolished by the law of 1795 (*La Révolution française*, Vol. LII, January, 1907); but does he not say in his *The French Revolution*, III, 262, that in 1795 the constitutional clergy no longer had any legal existence?

[329] Pisani, II, 192.

Somme. Royer was an honest nobody; Saurine, an intelligent but fantastic man; Gratien, a learned man deluded by all the revolutionary prejudices; Desbois, a priest of irreproachable morals and especially a money lender.[330] At the suggestion of Grégoire the five prelates formed a permanent council, styling itself the Council of United Bishops. Its first acts were to establish a party journal which took the title of *Annales de la religion,* and then with money placed at its disposal by Desbois, set up on rue Saint-Jacques an *imprimerie-librairie-chrétienne* destined to become the chief propaganda machine of the constitutional Church.[331] Some devoted laymen placed at the service of the "United" the full ardor which they had recently employed in favor of the Civil Constitution. On March 15, 1795, ten constitutional bishops published a document entitled, *Lettre encyclique de plusieurs évêques de France à leurs frères les autres évêques et aux églises vacantes.* This letter contained dogmatic declarations and disciplinary decisions: the belief in all that the Church believes was proposed while making reservations on the power of the pope; then, severe measures inspired by Jansenist rigorism were laid down with respect to those who had taken part in the worship of Reason.[332] In order to bring back the faithful to "the beautiful times of the primitive Church," they decided that in all the chief towns of dioceses whose bishop had died or disappeared, the senior pastors, united in a council under the name of "presbytery," would assume the directive authority. In fulfillment of this prescription, on March 31, 1795, four Paris pastors organized the presbytery of Paris, which, though not without storms, directed the constitutional clergy of Paris until November 3, 1801.[333] Pushing their audacity further, the "united bishops" installed themselves on April 27 in the church of Saint-Médard without having bought the property or rented it or obtained any title of administration. Many other episcopal cities (e.g., Versailles and Colmar) made up presbyteries like that of Paris. Grégoire, the soul of the entire movement, spent himself on it without counting the cost.

---

[330] On these bishops, see Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel.*

[331] The *Annales de la religion* lasted until 1803. For its foundation, see Gazier, *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution*, pp. 282–88. To combat this *Annales,* Fathers Sicard and Jauffret founded the *Annales religieuses et littéraires* in February, 1796, which, under the direction of Father de Boulogne, soon became the *Annales catholiques.*

[332] See the text of this letter in the *Annales de la religion,* I, 49–58.

The leader of the constitutional Church was not satisfied with being impudent to the civil authorities: he was far too aggressive and haughty to the clergy who had not taken the oath. Strict in regard to repentent sinners, he accused those who did not take the oath of moral laxity, letting fly at them the revived epigrams of Pascal. The law of May 30, which permitted the opening of churches, was a new point of conflict between the constitutional clergy and those loyal to the pope. Here the non-jurors had to retreat before the jurors; there the two clergies continued to be separated like the hours of the day; everywhere Catholics were to suffer attacks and intrigues from the party to which Grégoire had given direction, a party few in number, but active and busy, whose several members had compromised with the men of the Revolution. Not only had Durand de Maillaine and Lanjuinais collaborated with Daunou and Boissy d'Anglas in drawing up the famous constitution of 1795, but they were always fighting their common enemy, the clergy who submitted to the pope.

During this time the loyal clergy suffered from fresh and painful divisions, born on the occasion of the promise of submission to the laws of the Republic which the law of May 30 had required from priests to allow them the use of the churches. Some spurned it with horror as apostasy, others counseled it as licit and useful. Said the former: "Religion and justice join to forbid such a step." They showed that incompatible with the most formal laws of the Church were many laws of the Republic: the laws authorizing divorce, suppressing the Sabbath repose, consecrating the Republican calendar, and authorizing the sale of Church property; and that even when the act of submission would not be contrary to religion, it would still be illicit because, in making it, priests would be recognizing the Republic, a recognition incompatible with the fidelity due to the legitimate sovereign.[334]

---

[333] The register of the deliberations of the "presbytery of Paris" is preserved in the archives of Grazier.

But many ecclesiastics, among others de Bausset, bishop of Alais, Father de Boulogne, director of the *Annales ecclésiastiques,* and in particular Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice, were not upset by this reasoning. To prove that the promise of submission was licit, Father Emery showed that the promised submission might be regarded simply as opposition to the revolt; but Catholics have as a principle that of non-rebellion, even against faulty laws; that submission to the laws of the state should be understood as a submission to civil and political laws; moreover, that this submission implied neither approval of these laws nor of the authority to which they submitted. To support his interpretation he called upon the text of a circular sent June 17, 1795, by the legislative committee to the directories of departments. Says the circular: "For you to point out that the Civil Constitution of the Clergy is no longer a law of the Republic, is useless for you. Besides, always recall this principle: the law purposes to assure and facilitate more and more the free practice of religion." [335] As to the usefulness of the proposed step, Father Emery saw it in the possibility of taking immediate possession of the churches, coveted by the constitutionals and threatened with disaffection or ruin, and bringing them back to the use of Catholic worship.

Meanwhile a law of September 20, 1795, stated more precisely the sense of the promise, imposing the following formula: "I recognize that the whole citizenry is the ruler, and I promise submission and obedience to the laws of the Republic." The arguments continued, urged on by one side or the other with ardent convictions, becoming more and more sharp and painful. In the mean time the labors of Daunon, Boissy d'Anglas, Durand de Maillaine, and Lanjuinais had finally resulted (August 10, 1795) in the Constitution of the year III by which an effort was made, without returning to the monarchy, to avoid the disagreeable features of the means employed by demagogues. The executive power, confined to a directory of five members elected for five years; the legislative power and the judicial power, divided between two elected councils and renewable periodically; and an ingenious system of election in two stages: all this division of powers was calculated to make any dictatorship impossible. On October 26, 1795, the Convention broke up; the next day the government was formed on a new basis, and the horizon opened on hopes for order and peace.

---

[334] Notice published by one part of the episcopate and quoted by Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé,* VI, 398.

[335] Quoted by Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 435.

CHAPTER VI

The Church Supplanted by Civil Religion (1795–99)

ORDER and peace were the two outstanding needs of France; but the regime of the Directory was unable to satisfy these needs. In confiding the executive power to five men and the legislative power to two different bodies, the authors of the Constitution of 1795 aimed at neutralizing tyrannical influences, but they merely stirred up conflicts, strifes, and *coups d'état*. This result was the more to be expected since behind these constituted powers two new influences were growing and tending toward predominance: that of the ideologists of the Institute and that of the generals of the army.

An incomplete account of the spiritual movement and even of the political movement of this period would be given if the Institute were left out. "This grand, learned body," writes Albert Vandal, "which took its existence from the Constitution, under the same title as the Directory and the two councils, almost formed a fourth power in the state. It was the guardian of doctrine." [1]

The shrewd ambition of General Bonaparte was not mistaken here. He hastened to add that "he belonged to the religion of the Institute." [2] These words were a way of expressing the cleverest compliment. Most of the members of the Institute were deeply anti-Christian. Napoleon was confronted with their impious sectarianism at the time of the Concordat. From this body, as we shall see, rose the system destined to replace the Catholic religion.

---

[1] Vandal, *L'avènement de Bonaparte,* p. 4.

[2] See Aulard, *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française,* II, 143.

On the other hand, by the same force of events, the influence of the generals made itself felt even in the political field. The momentous wars of the Convention had stirred up extreme patriotism. In the midst of heaped-up ruins the military establishment had grown in power. Such leaders as Marceau, Hoche, Kleber, and Massena, were strong with the confidence of the soldier. One still more famous would rise in the Italian campaigns and soon absorb all the others. Meanwhile everything that called itself patriotic or national was sure to find an echo among the people. If a new religion could become acclimated in France, this would have to be, seemingly, a national religion.

Until then the Revolution was a work especially of destruction; the Directory now assumed the task of rebuilding. Moreover, politicians, theorists, and generals were all imbued with that vague idealism taken from Rousseau's writings, which were an influence inspiring the entire revolutionary work. Robespierre had said, in a program of action as vast as the world: "We wish to substitute in our country morality for selfishness, truth for splendor, a high-minded and mighty people for a frivolous and wretched people, the virtues of the Republic for the vices of the monarchy. We desire that France may become the model of nations, the fear of oppressors, the consolation of the downtrodden. To see the dawn of universal happiness shining, that is our ambition, our goal." [3] The foes of Robespierre, in breaking his political power, had nothing to disown in this program. Rousseau's philosophy, on which they had all been nourished, reminded them that "the question is less of convincing men than of arousing them"; [4] that "morality reaches men only by robbing them of all their faculties"; [5] "by the passions we must make men happy." [6] They concluded that their action ought to be first of all a religious action. But the new religion would have to be distinct from the old one by two traits: it would be natural and civic. Grégoire had said: "The Revolution returns us to nature." [7] David added: "Men are only what the government makes them."

---

[3] *Rapport du 5 fevrier, 1794,* on the principles of public morals.

[4] Mirabeau, *Travail sur l'éducation publique,* 1791, p. 22.

[5] Talleyrand, *Rapport sur l'instruction publique,* 1791, p. 111.

[6] Vergniaud, in the session of November 9, 1792; *Moniteur* of November 11.

The foundation of a natural and civic religion was now going to be the dominant preoccupation of the men who pretended to guide public opinion under the Directory. Such an undertaking was certain to run aground, but only after it had profoundly disturbed men's souls and upset society.

One man who despised the theorists of the Directory and who scornfully called them "the ideologists," General Bonaparte, had devised a more practical project. With that positive spirit, and that sense of the real and the realizable which he would reveal later with so much clearness in the discussion of the civil code and in the negotiation of the Concordat, Bonaparte understood that the only religion to restore was the traditional religion of France, and the only way to make it a national institution was by coming to terms with the pope. In the first days of June, 1796, following the events to which we have just returned, he sent to Pius VI, through the good offices of Azara, the Spanish minister at Rome, the request for a papal bull recognizing the new Constitution. With this act they would answer for the French government's side with generous and kindly measures in regard to the Church. The Pope did not refuse to enter upon the path thus proposed and, at any rate, the draft of a brief was drawn up which corresponded with the presumed wishes of the Directory.[8] Pius VI proclaimed the recognition of the French Republic and charged Catholics to be subject to it "without allowing themselves to be misled by an ill-ordered devotion (*sub pietatis colore*) which would give the innovators a pretext to discredit religion."[9] Cacault,[10] the representative of France at Rome, communicated the document to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Delacroix, in August, 1796, and the *Annales de la religion*[11] published it as did the *Annales catholiques*.[12] But as the French government had never given or definitely promised the legitimate satisfactions which General Bonaparte had led to be expected, the brief was not even communicated to the bishops and the nuncios, nor was it officially promulgated in any manner.[13]

---

[7] Grégoire, *Rapport* of 12 Prairial, year I.

[8] Pisani, III, 95; Giobbio, *La chiesa e lo stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione*, pp. 305, 323, 324; De Teil, *Naples et le Directoire*, p. 238.

This brief, which bore the date of July 5, 1796, and which began with the words *Pastoralis sollicitudo,* thus never had any canonical value. This circumstance, however, was not an evident matter for the people of the day. The publication of the brief stirred up tempests. While the royal *émigrés* asserted that it was false, that it was a pure invention and was reprobated by the Pope,[14] at the same time the Jacobins called it "a shameful recantation;"[15] while, curiously enough, the constitutionals violently attacked an act which no longer in any way gave them the exclusive privilege of submission to the laws,[16] the superior of St. Sulpice seeing in this brief, whose authenticity he did not question, the confirmation of his opinion, published a translation in a small pamphlet.[17] It appeared that the document expressed the Pope's thoughts; it was never promulgated, nor was it ever further attacked.[18]

---

[9] See the full Latin text in Pisani, III, 109.

[10] He had received his credentials January 19, 1793. See Gendry, II, 233.

[11] *Annales de la religion,* III, 489–91.

[12] *Annales catholiques,* II, 241–43.

[13] See a letter of the Secretary of State, published in the *Annales catholiques,* III, 477.

[14] *Annales catholiques,* III, 476.

[15] *Amis des lois,* cited by Pisani, III, 101.

[16] *Annales de la religion,* V, 529–51.

[17] Paris, printed by Guebart.

[18] The discussions, raised with respect to the brief *Pastoralis* among the men of the day, were perpetuated by historians. Baldassari believes in its authenticity; Méric, in his *Histoire de M. Emery,* places it in doubt; Gendry does not venture to

Second Encyclical of the Constitutionals

Napoleon's daring project had failed, but it would be repeated with greater success five years later. In the interim the Constitutional Church, profiting by the division of the Catholics, gained strength, claimed to be the national Church in the full force of the term, and was unwilling to share this title with any other institution.

On December 13, 1795, the four constitutional bishops who had taken the name of "United" published a second encyclical addressed "to their brethren the other bishops and to the vacant Churches." Protesting "their unshakable firmness in the faith and in the ancient discipline," they haughtily laid claim to an exclusive right of regulating the internal organization of the Gallican Church, denying this right both to the pope and to the state. They proclaimed the abolition of episcopal councils (established in 1791), abandoning, they said, "that innovation ill according with the pen of history," and replaced the councils by "presbyteries." [19] Their aim was the convoking of a national council; at this council the Church of France would receive its definitive organization. The encyclical of March 15, 1795, had clearly declared that religion was a national affair, and that the Catholic Church was nothing more than an aggregation of different national Churches united by the bonds of charity.[20] The national council then logically became the supreme authority. But the lack of safety on the highways, which were infested by bandits, and the disturbance of wars, had until now delayed the meeting of the assembly. According to the *Annales de la religion,* they were waiting "for the olive

---

pronounce clearly and merely speaks of it "with utmost reserve" (Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 250). Pisani is of the opinion that a simple outline of the brief was prepared, which the unwillingness of the Directory did not permit to be followed up. Pisani, III, 95–100. This last view seems to us the most likely.

[19] Encyclical letter of December 13, 1795, p. 44.

[20] Encyclical letter of March 13, 1795 (chapter 3, article 1 of the preamble).

branch of peace to cast its shadow over the soil of the fatherland." [21] This moment seemed to have arrived in the spring of 1797. A circular in the month of March gave notice that the meeting of the council was not far off.[22] A semi-official note, published in the *Annales,* fixed the solemn opening for August 15, the feast of the Assumption. On July 22 the *Annales de la religion,* at the close of negotiations with the Directory, announced that the government stated it "could only applaud such peaceful and admirable intentions" as those that have been made known to it with regard to the coming council.[23]

The assembly, opened as scheduled, was presided over by Claude Le Coz, bishop of Rennes.[24] Grégoire had cleverly remained in the background. To prevent Le Coz from taking the leadership of the opposition, Grégoire supported him for the presidency. Le Coz was an obstinate and aggressive man and accomplished in debate. For the past two years he had supplied bitter contributions to the *Annales de la religion,* being always ready to speak and to write, with equal self-assurance, on any subject whatever. Grégoire thought that in an assembly which was not lacking in utopians and loquacious men, Le Coz, instead of being a perpetual leader of the opposition, would make an authoritative presiding officer, and with a firm hand would be able to hold in check the nervous or calculated agitations of the malcontents and therefore to dominate them.

In turning over the journals of the period, the *Annales de la religion* and the *Voix du Conciliateur,* which praise the deeds and achievements of the conciliar fathers, the *Annales catholiques* and the *Patriote français,* which note the regrettable incidents, and especially in reading the valuable and almost unobtainable *Journal de concile national de France,*[25] we can note that important manifestation whose soul was Grégoire.

---

[21] *Annales de la religion,* II, 543.

[22] Ibid., V, 144.

[23] *Ibid.,* V, 305.

[24] In their encyclical of December 13, 1795, the United Bishops had given up the name of the department of which they called themselves bishops and took the name of their episcopal city.

The meetings of the congregations were held in a rented house on rue des Saints-Pères; the solemn sessions were held at Notre Dame. The *Journal du concile national* mentions the presence of nine bishops and fifty-two priests at the first session.[26] The sixth and last session took place on November 15.

The outstanding event was the reading of a long report by Grégoire, entitled "Report of the United Bishops."[27] After giving a table of the constitutional Church,[28] he recommended the various works of propaganda undertaken under its auspices: the *Annales de la religion,* the *Voix du conciliateur,* and the *Société de philosophie chrétienne,* founded "to tighten the bonds which, by joining the love of religion with love of the Republic, would identify the qualities of Christians and of citizens."[29] The author of the report then enlarged on his correspondence with foreign Churches. For some time past, this widespread propaganda was his chief concern. As the Constituents at the time when they were drawing up the Declaration of the Rights of Man, as Robespierre when he was having decreed the worship of the Supreme Being and belief in the immortality of the soul, Grégoire likewise wished to exert his influence on the world. He spoke of works that he had sent to Spain, of constitutional encyclicals that had been spread abroad from Trebizond to Quebec, of the hopes he expected to be realized in Germany, where the *Annales de la religion* had been translated, of General Toussaint-Louverture's request "for a dozen priests who had submitted to the laws," [30] of steps he had taken to introduce the spirit of the Constitutional Church into all the colonies, and of his hopes to see the disappearance of the temporal power of the popes and the Inquisition. To the grand inquisitor of Spain he wrote a long letter intended to make him ashamed of his office.[31]

---

[25] This Journal appeared from August 17 to November 15, 1797. The *Voix du conciliateur* appeared likewise during the sessions of the council in seven numbers of twenty-four pages each. The purpose of the latter publication was doctrinal and polemical. Pisani, following the *Annales de la religion,* states that he "was not able to have at his disposal the *Journal du concile.*"

[26] *Journal du concile,* no. 1, pp. 20–22. The *Journal* gives the list of the members present.

[27] This report is found reproduced in the *Annales de la religion,* VI, 1–28, 29–73, 223–28.

[28] The table is not accurate. See Pisani, III, 158.

[29] *Annales de la religion,* VI, 17.

Decrees of the Pseudo-council

Purely theological questions held little place in the acts of the council. Hardly noticeable was a timid demonstration in favor of Jansenism in the decree on faith,[32] and a trace of Gallican opinions in the decree on marriage,[33] the essence of which was in the civil contract. The decrees about worship and discipline engaged the further attention of the members of the council. To be noted also are the wise prescriptions about the conduct of the clergy and the faithful, and the measures to be taken to safeguard children from the corruptive lessons of immoral or impious teachers.[34] But what seemed to be dominant was the desire to make of the Constitutional Church a national and republican Church. The council's first decree begins with the following articles: "Article 1: Every French Catholic owes to the laws of the Republic an entire and genuine submission. Article 2: The Gallican Church admits to the ranks of its pastors only those who shall have shown their fidelity to the Republic." [35] The council at the same time endeavored to reconcile among its own members the two parties of the juring fathers: those who followed Grégoire and those who remained faithful to the ideas of Gobel; it tried a conciliation with the non-jurors and in this sense wrote a letter to the Pope; at the same time it tended to penetrate the masses, whom it invited to its grand ceremonies in the metropolitan church of Paris.

---

[30] *Ibid.*, VI, 55–58.

[31] See this letter, *ibid.*, pp. 373–96.

[32] *Journal du concile*, November 15, 1797, pp. 171–75.

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 162–64. Article 1 says: "The Gallican Church recognizes as legitimate marriages only those that have been contracted in accord with the civil laws."

[34] *Annales de la religion*, VI, 85–88.

[35] *Journal du concile*, September 7, 1797, p. 51.

Failure of the Council

None of these goals was attained. The elections in the month of Floreal of the year V shifted the powers to the moderates. On 29 Prairial (June 17, 1797), Camille Jordan, deputy from Lyons, said what has since then been often repeated: "Give us the religion of our fathers." *The Annales de la religion* accused Jordan of being in accord with the non-juring priests.[36] On 7 Fructidor (August 24) the elders passed the resolution that opened the doors of France to all the exiled priests. The constitutionals saw therein a lessening of their hope to keep for themselves a privileged position in France. The *coup d'état* of 18 Fructidor (September 4, 1797) did not alter the situation. Three days later Le Coz vainly had the conciliar assembly take a solemn oath of submission to the Republic. The Council of the Five Hundred, upon receiving notification of this oath on September 21 (fifth complementary day of the year V), declared that "they could not recognize that religious corporation." [37] The Pope did not reply to the letter which the pseudo-council sent to him.

But Grégoire's work was not altogether futile. He reunited and reorganized the constitutional Church, which had been scattered by the Terror.

> Dispersed, frightened, dishonored by the faults of their confreres, the juring priests wandered like stray sheep. The council gave them confidence. In three-fourths of the departments the constitutional

---

[36] *Annales de la religion,* V, 499.

[37] *Moniteur,* September 26, 1797, p. 20.

bishops resumed their functions. Grégoire's energy had accomplished this wonder: not that of a dead man brought back to life, but of a corpse which a powerful electric current made stand up on its feet. After 18 Fructidor, however, the persecution begins again, less bloody than that of 1793, but no less dangerous, often more perfidious. In the course of this trial, the corpse, momentarily galvanized, slowly fell into decomposition from which it had been drawn by the mighty but artificial effort of the council.[38]

A National Religion

Thus neither the clergy that submitted to Rome nor the constitutional clergy satisfied what had been one of the most cherished and persistent dreams of the men of the Revolution: to found a national religion, rejuvenated in its dogmas and its discipline, and to make of that religion an instrument of propaganda for the revolutionary doctrines. Such had been one of the first aims of the Constituent Assembly. Such was still the aim of the Directory.[39]

But on the morrow of the Fructidor *coup d'état,* while feeling the need of shaking loose from the Constitutional Church, the new government found a new religion, already organized, which seemed more in conformity with its own aspirations: this was the cult of theophilanthropy.

This new religion came forth from the initiative of a book publisher, Chemin-Dupontès, a person otherwise insignificant, who, in October, 1796, issued a *Manuel des théanthropophiles.* Freemason Chemin seemed to have no other purpose but to found a sort of open Freemasonry;[40] but his project was revised and broadened by a man of higher intellectual worth, the philanthropist Valentin Hauy, who was the renowned founder of the Institute of Blind Workingmen. Hauy himself seems to have belonged to Freemasonry;[41] at any rate he had enthusiastically rallied to the revolutionary ideas.

---

[38] Pisani, III, 177.

[39] This conclusion is what two historians, belonging to diametrically opposed views, had demonstrated: Father Sicard, in his *A la recherche d'une religion civile,* and Mathiez, in his second doctoral thesis, *Les origines des cultes révolutionnaires.*

[40] This expression is the one used by Mathiez in his learned work, *La théophilanthropie et le culte decadaire,* p. 82. Mathiez destroyed the legend that made Larevellière-Lépeaux the inventor of theophilanthropy.

The new religion, which Hauy called theophilanthropy instead of theanthropophily, rested on the twofold dogma of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. But these truths should not be proved by reason; they were admitted "as necessary for the preservation of society and the welfare of the individuals." Morality rested on a principle as simple as it was also vague. The *Manual* said: "Good is everything that tends to preserve man and to perfect him." Worship was at the same time domestic and public. Domestic worship consisted in two essential acts: an elevation of the soul each morning before the marvels of creation; an examination of conscience each evening before going to sleep. The public worship is first of all paid to God under the vault of the sky, "the only temple worthy of the Divinity"; but people were to assemble also "in temples built by the genius of men." [42] The direction of the Society of Theophilanthropists pertained to two committees, one charged with the material and financial part, the other with the religious and moral part.

The first meeting for worship was held on January 9, 1797. The new cult at first seems to have met with only indifference or hostility on the part of the towns and the government. But the crisis of the year V had a considerable influence on its development.

---

[41] Mathiez, *op. cit.,* p. 89. Valentin Hauy was the brother of Father Hauy, an excellent priest, the creator of cristallography.

[42] The following are some excerpts from the prayer proposed to the theophilanthropists: "Father of nature, I do not ask of Thee the power to do good; Thou hast given me this power and with it the conscience to love the good, reason for knowing it, the freedom to choose it. . . . I will not address Thee with indiscreet prayers. . . . I beg of Thee only to correct my errors and those of others, because nearly all the evils that afflict men come from their errors. . . . Fully trusting in Thy justice and Thy goodness, my only desire is that Thy will be done" (quoted by Mathiez, *op. cit.,* p. 96).

The Directors, until then united, were now divided. Carnot and Barthélemy desired a policy of appeasement, but Rewbell and Larevellière-Lépeaux, considering the Republic in danger, counseled violent measures. After 18 Fructidor the deportation of Barthélemy and the flight of Carnot left the power in the hands of their foes.

Larevellière-Lépeaux, the son of a Vendean middle-class father, at an early age withdrew from Catholicism, which he regarded as an instrument of oppression and corruption. At Angers, where he settled after the Constituent Assembly, he had been one of the leading orators of the revolutionary clubs. He was a clever and experienced lawyer and enjoyed a general reputation for honesty. But nothing was sacred to this man when his dominant passion spoke in him: that passion was hatred for priests. This educated bourgeois had another passion: innate contempt for the populace.[43]

The time was the moment when General Bonaparte was marching against Rome and when the days of the papacy seemed to be numbered. Larevellière, if we are to accept the *Mémoires* of Barras, showed for the first time his sympathy for the theophilanthropists.[44] To him this utterly simple worship seemed to be of a nature to replace advantageously the dying Christianity. At the Institute,[45] of which he was a most influential member, he delivered a discourse devoted almost wholly to the praise of theophilanthropy. Of a melancholy nature and romantic imagination, Larevellière, when speaking of the new religion, soared to lyrical heights. The replacing of a fallen Catholicism by a simple, reasonable, natural, and grand worship was his chimera. "I tell you," he said, "that man has in him a religious fiber which we must recognize. . . . Society asks of you a God that is not the God of Catholicism." Presently adherents came to him from all the parties. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, author of *Paul et Virginie,* the poet Marie-Joseph Chénier, the journalist Sébastien Mercier, the poet Andrieux, the former minister Servan, the ex-Barnabite Dubroca, who became the outstanding orator of the sect, all these flocked to theophilanthropy. Some towns raised obstacles against the ceremonies of the new worship; Larevellière and the minister of police, Sotin, overcame these oppositions.[46] "The theophilanthropists were openly favored, they received subsidies, their books were placed in the program of the official schools, Hauy was appointed a member of the board of education of the department of the Seine, the Institute itself joined the party and appointed a commission "instructed to find out means of making the speeches and the music of the national feasts heard by all those present, however numerous they might be." [47] The theophilanthropists at Paris used, concurrently with the Catholics, a large number of churches, among which were Notre Dame and St. Eustache. Grégoire has left us a description of their religious ceremonies, in which "readers" vested in a blue habit, with a rose-colored cincture and a white gown, read in turn from the Bible, Confucius, Aristotle, Voltaire, and Franklin.[48]

---

[43] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

[44] Barras, *Mémoires*, II, 347.

[45] On May 1, 1797.

But division soon made its appearance among the leaders of theophilanthropy. One of the new followers, Etienne Siauve, an apostate priest and head of the philosopher theophilanthropists, complained that the religion imagined by Chemin was not sufficiently in accord with the principles of Rousseau and the republican ideal; but the people, for whose sake all the ceremonies had been provided, gave evidence of a growing dislike for these novelties. At Sainte-Marguerite, during the office, a placard was posted bearing these words: "Band of pickpockets! Watch out for your handkerchiefs." The words had a notable success. The people jokingly called the followers of the new religion the "band of pickpockets." An official report (in the month of Nivôse, year VII) said: "The number of theophilanthropists is not increasing, and their worship is without acclaim." Chemin, discouraged, asked for a pension, and Dubroca requested a place in the ministry. After the forced resignation of Larevellière (June 18, 1799), the hopeless decline followed. From that time on, theophilanthropy merely vegetated. The police decree of 11 Ventôse of the year X, explicitly banning "the practice of the natural religion called theophilanthropy," thus confirmed an accomplished fact. The religion which had the favor of the Directory and the Institute did not enjoy two years of regular functioning.

---

[46] Mathiez, *La Révolution et l'Eglise* (1910), p. 207.

[47] *Ibid.,* p. 196.

[48] Grégoire, *Histoire des sectes religieuse,* I, 396.

The Weekly Holyday

The theophilanthropy had indeed met with the concurrence of another worship, that which was called the decadaire worship. This worship went back to the institution of the Republican calendar. A decree of 14 Germinal of the year VI (April 4, 1798) ordered the decadaire repose for all governmental bodies, and for all the work yards. The laws of 17 Thermidor (August 4, 1798) and 23 Fructidor (September 9) emphasized these ordinances. But soon the fact was evident that the people could not be condemned to the repose without doing something to occupy their time. Decadaire feasts were organized. The poet François Neufchâteau, who was now Minister of the Interior, with his facile and elegant pen drew up the program of national rejoicings. These included the feast of youth, that of married couples, that of old age, that of thanksgiving, and that of agriculture.[49]

At the feast of the sovereignty of the people, the old men and the fathers were to relate "their former exploits, the marvels of the Revolution, the principal traits of its history." In country districts the farmers, in the words of the program, "should gather about the wine-press and the still wet vats the active and faithful cohorts that have helped them in despoiling the mountains of their resplendent booty." [50]

---

[49] See Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 429.

Mighty efforts were made to exploit the Republican calendar. With its sonorous, poetical, and reminiscent names, which summoned before the eyes of the people the whole cycle of the year, from the splendors of Thermidor to the sadness of Nivôse, it was expected to win acceptance by its own worth and promptly to supplant the outmoded cycle of moribund Catholicism.

The decadi, last and culminating day of the decade, would replace Sunday. Instead of the Lord's Day the people would undoubtedly prefer "the Day of the Fatherland." In fact, the decadaire worship pretended to be, contrary to the old religions, which were based on absent and mysterious realities, the worship of these two palpable and visible realities: nature and fatherland. On the day of the decadi, then, in a scene both pastoral and solemn, the officials of the canton gathered the people about an altar raised to the glory of the nation, and then, with an accompaniment of organ music and song, read the laws and commented on them, questioned the children, and recounted the traits of civic virtue.

The hollowness of these feasts soon led to their lack of esteem. Then dances and games were introduced, conducted by song leaders. But the dance itself did not possess the gift of awakening the animation of these solemnities. Even under the Directory, the admission was made that people do not have the heart to dance every day.[51]

More was to follow. Soon the decadaire worship was seen to be, in the mind of its organizers, an instrument of the destruction of the Christian worship. "The idea of elevating the national sentiment by means of spectacles suited to strike the people's imagination, undoubtedly had in itself nothing but what was lofty and praiseworthy. It corresponded to the theatrical taste of the period. The folly of the revolutionists was to set it up in opposition to the traditional beliefs. The altar of the fatherland was erected in the midst of the church, often relegating the tabernacle to a place behind the choir or to some lower place on the side. During the lay office orders were given to remove the religious emblems entirely or to cover them. Catholics were given their place and their hours. At Paris the Catholic worship had to cease on the decadi at precisely half-past eight in the morning and could not be resumed until after the civil ceremonies, "provided, however, that it was not later than six o'clock in the evening in the summer, and eight o'clock in the winter." Elsewhere a number of government officials, on the pretext that the decadi was the only day legally a holiday and that the rest of the time should belong to work, issued a prohibition against the opening of the churches on any other day, whereby public worship had to bow before the decadaire worship and be subordinate to it.[52] Thus the decadi suppressed the Sunday, with which of course it was not in accord; it suppressed the Sunday Mass, the most important act of worship, the necessary act, the act which, in the eyes of the people, expresses and marks out the religious life.[53]

---

[50] Boissy d'Anglas, *Essai sur les fêtes,* p. 53.

[51] Sicard, *A la recherche d'une religion civile,* p. 185.

More oppression followed. "In certain respects the anti-religious mania passed all bounds and reached the height of the absurd to supreme ridicule. By a decree of 14 Germinal of the year IV, fish markets were forbidden to open on the days formerly Fridays; at Paris the oratory in the former chapel of the Carmelites was closed because at that place had been celebrated the feast of the Kings; at Strasbourg a merchant was found guilty for having set out, in his store, more fish than ordinarily; 350 gardeners were prosecuted for having sanctified the Sunday by not taking their vegetables to market that day."[54]

---

[52] See the decree of the consuls (7 Nivôse, year VIII), revoking these measures. *Correspondance de Napoléon,* VI, 4471.

[53] Albert Vandal, *L'avènement de Bonaparte* (1903), p. 30.

"To ridicule for such measures was soon added the irritation of the country people, who for the most part were attached to the religion of their fathers. They were annoyed, they were disturbed in their habits, in the sale of their produce, in their way of reckoning the days and months, in all their religious convictions. So many various causes were sure to strike with sterility all the efforts of the Revolution in spite of the continually renewed attempts and a perseverance that continued for almost ten years."[55] Edgar Quinet wrote: "Feasts, anniversaries of the Revolution, where are you? The people have not kept a single one of the feasts instituted from 1789 to 1800. That immense commotion has not succeeded in removing even one village saint."[56]

Irreligion (1789–99)

From 1789 to 1799 the religious ideal of the Revolution had, as we have seen, undergone a profound decline. The authors of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy still believed in the Church, although distorting the notion of it; the constitutional fathers of Grégoire's school, even after their schism, professed their faith in the divinity of Christ; the theophilanthropists had established their worship on the basic dogmas of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul; the adherents of the decadaire cult saw in the Revolution and the fatherland a vague incarnation of the Divinity. But, under the Directory, the learned body that had the high pretention of directing the movement of ideas, the Institute, was made up of men who had lost all belief in Christ, in God, and in an immortal soul. Lalande, Naigeon, Cabanis, Volney, all these were out-and-out materialists, avowed atheists.

---

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 33. For the text of the decrees, see Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile*, III, 176, 390.

[55] Sicard, *loc. cit.*

[56] Quinet, *Œuvres*, II, 91.

"In every work that competed for the prize of the Institute," says Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, "the name of God was for them a sign of reprobation." The author of *Les harmonies de la nature* experienced the sentiments of his colleagues when (July 3, 1798) he was reading to them a report on the foundation of morality. Scarcely had he pronounced the name of God when a cry of rage broke out in the meeting. He was jeered at, threatened, and challenged to a duel. They asked him where he had seen God, what shape God had. Shouted Cabanis: "I swear that there is no God." Bernardin de Saint-Pierre was obliged to leave the hall. His report was not printed by the Institute: the author had to resort to the expedient of having it distributed at the door of the assembly hall.[57]

In 1796 an article in the *Décade philosophique,* attributed to the academician Andrieux,[58] greeted the appearance of Diderot's posthumous work, *La religieuse,* in which convent life was portrayed with the features most calculated to make it hated.[59] In 1798 the academician Naigeon, emphasizing his atheistic propositions by tendentious notes, brought out the complete works of Diderot. The irreligious book of Dupuis on *L'origine de tous les cultes,* which appeared in 1795 and was published in an abridged popular edition in 1796, went to the extreme of contempt for all religion.

---

[57] See Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, *Œuvres,* I, 236–45. The report will be found, VII, 371–87.

[58] Diderot, *Œuvres,* V, 5.

[59] Some writers (e.g., Ludovic Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé,* I, 150) have thought that Diderot's *La religieuse* influenced the abolition of monastic vows. True, some literary critics (e.g., Louandre in his *Introduction aux Conteurs français de XVIII^e siècle*) made the same mistake. *La religieuse,* written about 1770, was known at that time by a few friends of the author in manuscripts that circulated secretly; but it was not published until the year V. See Diderot, *ibid.,* V, 3, 175.

From such a regime, whatever the apparent moderation of its policy, nothing could be expected but vexatious measures against Catholicism. This fear became a reality. While with one hand, as we might say, the Directory sought to erect a new religion, with the other it ceaselessly struck the Catholic Church in head and members. Some historians have judged they might call this period the Little Terror or the Second Terror. The period well deserves this name. "On certain points the Directory aggravated the Great Terror itself, whether by more scholarly or more severe laws or by the privilege it assumed of executing these laws itself." [60]

The Terror under the Directory

The "Second Terror" did not begin in reality until after 18 Fructidor (September, 1797), but attacks upon the Holy See date from the first days of the Directory.

Let us recall that (February 6, 1793), after the murder of Bassville, the Convention imposed on the Pope several conditions to be carried out if he wished to avoid war with France. Whether he doubted the sincerity of the French government or found those conditions unacceptable, the Supreme Pontiff considered that he could not accept them.

This attitude which in other times would have aroused the most violent recriminations, passed almost unnoticed. The plans of the Conventionals were not in agreement: Robespierre was expressly against an invasion of Rome; the internal divisions which split the Convention turned its attention from any other affairs; furthermore, the French troops had too much to do elsewhere, and conditions were not ready for a campaign in Italy.

---

[60] Victor Pierre, *La Terreur sous le Directoire* (1887), p. viii.

One of the first concerns of the Directory was to realize the threats made by the Convention. To meet this need it had to count on the army.

Amid so many accumulated ruins, the Convention, as we have already remarked, left untouched one institution, the army. As Albert Vandal wrote: "At the time of the great spasm the accumulated energy at the basis of French generations, an energy fashioned in the virile education of the old regime, suddenly aroused by the patriotic idea, occurred in a terrifying explosion. . . . Apparently the force, the heat, and the richness of the Gallic blood took refuge in the armies that continued to defend the Republic." [61] The names of Marceau, Hoche, and Schérer eclipsed those of Larevellière-Lépeaux, Rewbell, and Letourneur. The spirit of the army was indeed republican, but among its leaders the most ambitious and most clear-sighted saw in the conflict of parties a role of regulator and arbiter to be taken. Hoche offered himself for this role; another would soon seize on it and exercise it with almost incredible daring. When (October 5, 1795) Barras needed "to sweep the rebellious sections," he chose as his assistant a young brigadier general whose energy and coolness had been manifested but lately in the siege of Toulon; this genius was General Bonaparte. A few days later Barras resigned in favor of his protégé, who thus found himself invested with the command of the army of the interior. On March 26, 1796, the Directory appointed him to replace Schérer, who had resigned, to head the command of the army in Italy.

Little by little Bonaparte's dominance effaced that of all the other generals. The Italian campaign, which is not our business to relate here, revealed in him who was destined to be the Emperor Napoleon, the most eminent qualities of tactician and statesman. A few months afterward, all echoes were repeating his glorious name; some dreading it, others placing in him all their hope. The popular imagination was obsessed with the image of the hero; and doubtless splendid visions of the future were already in his mind. On April 17, 1796, Bonaparte was indeed already speaking as a master of the world: "The French people," he said, in a proclamation, "is the friend of all peoples; come forth to meet her." The Directors wrote to him: "You have the Directory's confidence: the services that you render daily give you a right to it."

---

[61] Vandal, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

To this man the Directory entrusted the task of carrying out its plan of vengeance against the Holy See. On February 3, 1796, he received a letter from the French government which "counseled" him to go and extinguish in Rome "the torch of fanaticism." [62] "This is a resolve that we have formed," the Directors wrote to him.[63] The General, who at that time was pursuing his able campaign against Austria, did not at once turn aside from his plan, which was to terrify his enemy by the rapidity of his conquests in northern Italy. When, disconcerted by his daring, the Austrian troops had carried out their retreat movement from the Adda to the Mincio, Bonaparte turned toward Rome.

On May 11 a messenger who was sent to the Secretary of State, Zelada, by the legates of Ferrara and Bologna, announced to him that 10,000 French had debouched on the plain of Piacentino and were marching against the Eternal City. All resistance was futile. Pius VI was not in a condition to sustain a war against the Republic. The States of the Church, deprived of a regular army and lacking generals, could not dream of fighting against war-hardened, disciplined soldiers, led by able officers. To purchase peace, as the King of Sardinia and the dukes of Parma and of Modena had just done, and as the King of Naples was preparing to do, was the only move possible. In the previous year, by a secret article of the treaty of 4 Thermidor (July 22, 1795), Spain had been recognized as intermediary between France and the Holy See. Pius VI instructed the ambassador Azara to proceed to Milan as minister plenipotentiary, there to halt the French at the very gateway of his States and to conclude an armistice with them.

---

[62] Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 462.

[63] Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 269.

Don José Nicolas de Azara, accredited to Pope Clement XIII in 1765, and since then maintained at his post, was an old career diplomat, acquainted with all the traditions of the papal chancery. For twenty years, the friend and at times the rival of Bernis (the ambassador of France), he was equally familiar with the usages of French diplomacy. Renown places him among the most expert diplomats of his time.[64] He showed himself worthy of his reputation.

General Bonaparte, who then held the city of Milan, had there abolished the authority of the pope and imprisoned Cardinal Ferrara. He haughtily declared that he would not treat with the representative of Spain except out of consideration for his court. Then he signified, without other formality, that he was demanding of Rome all that he would be able to have if he were himself master of the Capitol. To this Azara said: "Go, then, and take it yourself." At this reply, Bonaparte jumped up, stormed, swore that he would have his treaty, and, in his fury, tore to pieces with his teeth a sheet of paper which he was holding in his hand, chewing it with frenzy. He was already the crafty negotiator who later, in a celebrated interview with Pius VII, displayed all the resources of the most versatile comedian and the most vehement tragedian.

Further griefs awaited Azara. He understood that, while in these stormy conferences he was defending inch by inch the rights of the pope and the Church, defections were occurring among the protégés of the Holy See. All the cities of Romagna had made their submission to the French; treason had slipped even into the Eternal City. Bonaparte received, from a well-informed person, an inventory of everything at Rome that was most precious in gold, silver, jewels, paintings, and statues, as well as a list of the palaces and of wealthy persons.[65] When in the morning of June 27 the conferences were resumed, at Azara's first attempts to reduce the demands of the Directory, Bonaparte arrogantly replied: "What have I to do with your proposals? The peoples themselves are my superiors." General Bonaparte, consenting to reduce his demands, decided to lower from 40,000,000 francs to 21,000,000 the sum which the Pope must pay the Republic. Besides this amount, the Holy See must turn over 500 manuscripts, 100 paintings and statues, notably the bust of Brutus, open its ports to French ships, close them to the ships of powers hostile to France, and permit French armed forces to pass through his territory whenever such permission would be requested.

---

[64] Vicomte de Richemont, "La première rencontre du pape et de la République française," in the *Correspondant* of September 10, 1897, p. 803.

The Armistice of Bologna

Such were the principal conditions of the armistice signed at Bologna on June 23, 1796. Napoleon's final concessions have sometimes been attributed to the regard he had for the King of Spain and to Azara's astuteness. In a letter written to the Directory two days before the treaty, the General indicated a different motive. He says: "This armistice being concluded with the Dog Star rather than with the army of the Pope, my opinion would be that you do not urge the making of peace, so that in September, if our affairs with Germany and northern Italy go well, we may seize Rome." [66]

At any rate Rome was saved. Azara wrote to the Pope: "The treaty that I have made is iniquitous, barbarous, and outrageous; but, to excuse it, I will say that I have saved a plank from the wreck. The person of Your Holiness, the Holy See, religion, all the inhabitants of Rome, everything there both sacred and profane would have been hopelessly lost." [67]

---

[65] Richemont, *op. cit.*, p. 807.

[66] Quoted by Gendry, *op. cit.*, II, 245.

The papal government at once set to work to carry out the treaty. From Castle Sant' Angelo were brought forth the ancient treasures which the popes had amassed there and had preserved under threat of the most terrible excommunications. The churches of the Papal States were required to turn over their objects of gold and silver; the simple citizens had to send to the treasury a complete list of the precious metals they possessed. The banker Torlonia and several other emissaries appealed to the credit of the different cities of Italy.

Meanwhile an envoy of the Pope, Pieracchi, discussed at Paris with the minister Delacroix the ratification of the armistice. At the very first conference (August 12) the minister increased his claims. To the clauses stipulated by General Bonaparte he added the obligation imposed on the Pope to revoke all the bulls relative to the affairs of France since 1789. This demand set forth inadmissible conditions. Pieracchi protested, Delacroix grew angry. The discussion ended by a decree of expulsion against Pieracchi and his colleague, Evangelisti (August 14, 1796).

On the other hand the people of Rome expressed their indignation against the conditions of the armistice. One morning on the walls could be seen placards bearing these words: "Neither paintings nor manuscripts shall leave Rome." French commissioners who had come to Rome for the purpose of assuring the execution of the armistice were thronged, hissed at, and insulted. The Pope, after the outrage inflicted on his legates and the Directory's refusal to ratify the treaty, considered that he was no longer obliged to observe it.

On September 12, Pius VI assembled the Sacred College and questioned the cardinals one after the other. The opinion of all was that the Holy See could not, without being false to its duties, subscribe to the terms that were demanded of it. A memorandum, intended to be presented to the Directory, was drawn up in this sense and two days later was read to the Sacred College. It ended with these words: "Let the Directory consider the motives that have constrained the conscience of His Holiness in a refusal that he will be obliged to sustain even at the peril of his life." At these words the one who was reading the document paused, saying: "Does Your Holiness quite mean these last words?" The Pope resolutely replied: "Yes, at the peril of my life." [68]

---

[67] Quoted by Richemont, *op. cit.*, p. 808.

The die had been cast; the supreme head of the Church had taken the resolution to defend the faith even to martyrdom.

Recoil of the Directory

Pius VI's energetic action gave momentary pause to the Directory. Bonaparte, then at Ferrara, called on the archbishop, Cardinal Mattei: "Your Eminence," he said, "the Directory does not desire war with Rome. I desire to be, not the destroyer, but the savior of that city." [69] We may suppose that Bonaparte, despite alliances with the revolutionists, hesitated before an attack on the Eternal City.[70] Moreover, an expedition against Rome at that moment, when he was considering the plan of turning his arms against Austria, would have made him lose precious time. Now he and the Pope abruptly changing their roles, he it was who for two months was urging the Pope to conclude a treaty, whereas the Pope was wisely deferring the action.

---

[68] Richemont, *op. cit.*, p. 332, according to the account of J. B. de Rossi, who learned the detail from his father, who was secretary of Cardinal Caleppi.

[69] Gendry, II, 268.

[70] Independently of his religious faith, which was never perhaps entirely stifled, either by his revolutionary utopias or by his own ambition, Bonaparte felt that at the close of 1796 the Catholic religion had again become a powerful social force. On December 4, 1796, Clarke wrote to him: "We have lacked our revolution in religion. In France they had again become Roman Catholic. . . . If one had been able to annihilate the Pope three years ago, Europe could have been regenerated; at the present moment, would not his abasement be to expose ourselves to a permanent alienation from the government of a crowd of Frenchmen that submits to the pope and that might rally to him?" *Correspondance inédite,* II, 430, quoted by A. Dufourq, *Le régime jacobin en Italie* (1900), p. 38.

In the course of sixty-nine days, fruitless conferences were held, in which Cacault represented the Directory and Cardinal Busca, then Cardinal Mattei, defended the cause of the Holy See. In the meantime the Pope was raising troops that he placed under the command of the Austrian general, Colli. Bonaparte advanced against the little force, crushed it (February 5, 1797) on the Senio, seized Ancona and Loreto, and then at Tolentino awaited the effects of his words of clemency and his acts of terror cleverly combined.

From Tolentino, where he arrived on February 13, the General sent to Rome Father Fumé, general of the Camaldolites, with instructions to say to Pius VI that Bonaparte was not an Attila and that, should he be so, the Pope might remember that he himself is the successor of Leo. To Cardinal Mattei he wrote: "I wish to prove to all Europe the moderation of the Directory. . . . I desire, as far as may be in my power, to give a striking proof of the moderation I have for the Holy See." [71]

The Pope thought he ought to yield to demands so repeated. A deputation, made up of Cardinal Mattei, Marquis Massimi, and the prelate Caleppi, set off for Tolentino. Said Pius VI to them: "Go and make every sacrifice except in what concerns religion." At the very first interview, Bonaparte, prudent statesman that he was, understood that in the spiritual field the plenipotentiaries would be unyielding. He played his part and showed all the resources of his wonderful genius, turn and turn about caressing and terrible, in fighting on the political and financial field. On February 19, 1797, after three days of discussion, the Treaty of Tolentino was signed. It contained twenty-six articles. The Pope recognized the French Republic, abandoned his rights over Comtat Venaissin, ceded to France three rich provinces which were the legations of Bologna and Ferrara and all Romagna, and promised to remit to the French government the sum of 30,000,000 francs. "Rome is saved," Mattei wrote sadly, "as also religion, but at the price of what sacrifices!" [72]

---

[71] Gendry, II, 275.

The carrying out of a treaty so onerous was for the Pope the occasion of grave solicitudes. In the Papal States revolutionary plots followed one another almost without interruption. Joseph Bonaparte arrived at Rome on August 31 to "watch over the execution of the treaty concluded by his illustrious brother," as we read in his credentials. He surrounded himself with all the malcontents as well as all the partisans of the new ideas. In the month of September, Pius VI, overwhelmed with grief, fell gravely ill.

Toward the end of December, while the Pope's robust constitution seemed about to triumph over his illness, a tragical event, somewhat like the murder of Bassville, which had been the occasion of so many evils, occurred to redouble the Pontiff's anxieties.

In the afternoon of December 28, 1797, a group of rioters ran through the city of Rome, shouting: "Long live liberty! Long live the French Republic!" They were answered with: "Long live the Pope! Long live the Madonna!" A detachment of cavalry advanced to drive back the band of rioters. Some French officers, with the commandant Duphot at their head, emerged from the Corsini palace, where the representative of the Directory, Joseph Bonaparte, was lodged. These officers confronted the papal cavalry. Their move, they said, was simply for the purpose of quieting the tumult; on the contrary, they manifestly inflamed it. Duphot, sword in hand, threatened a sergeant. The latter, after vainly ordering that the sword be returned to the scabbard, fired on him, the shot entering the lung.

---

[72] Letter of February 19, 1797, quoted by Gendry, II, 276.

The tumult subsided; the rioters, whom Cardinal Consalvi estimated at about 500, dispersed.[73] But Joseph protested that the embassy had been violated and abruptly left Rome. "Nothing," writes Cardinal Consalvi, "could hold him back, neither the request of the Holy See nor the offer of a considerable reparation in case some wrongs had been committed."

The Taking of Rome

At Paris the news of Duphot's death violently aroused public opinion. The newspapers misrepresented the facts.[74] The Directory had Marquis Massimi arrested, confiscated his papers, and ordered a march on Rome by a body of 15,000 men, followed by other corps. On January 11, 1798, Bonaparte wrote to General Berthier, who had been put at the head of the first corps: "The speed of your march on Rome is of the utmost importance. . . . You will advance to within two days of Rome, then threaten the Pope and all members of the government who have made themselves guilty of the greatest of all crimes, in order to fill them with fear and make them flee." [75] As we are told by Consalvi, "General Berthier's army arrived with the suddenness of lightning. On the evening of February 9 it occupied Monte Mario. . . . The following morning an officer and a trumpeter presented themselves at the gate known as the Angelica. They found the gate open and lacking any preparations of resistance. The Pope had not the forces to repel the invasion and he was unwilling to expose his people, who were ready to defend him. Furthermore, that defense would have been as perilous for the Romans as it would have been insufficient for the Holy Father." [76]

---

[73] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* p. 333.

[74] Two regrettable dispatches of the Secretary of State were exploited against the Holy See. By imprudence or excessive fear the Cardinal presented the excuses of the Holy See in such a manner that he furnished his adversaries with arms against his government. Gendry, II, 288.

[75] *Correspondance de Napoléon Ier,* III, 475.

Consalvi, who played an active part in the events that followed, relates with much feeling the painful scenes that took place in the Castle Sant' Angelo when he was ordered to take charge of its evacuation. With admirable energy and self-control, he succeeded in preventing a popular outburst, which the Directory had perhaps anticipated and secretly desired to justify its intrusion in Rome.

The sick Pontiff considered himself thereafter a prisoner. On February 15, 1798, the anniversary of his elevation to the papacy, he decided to hold pontifical services in the Sistine Chapel. In the evening General Cervoni notified him officially of his deposition and the proclamation of the Roman Republic. The Supreme Pontiff said that he adored the impenetrable decrees of Providence. He added: "I ask most earnestly that the Catholic religion be respected and that the blood of those who have faithfully served me shall not be shed." [77]

As the general, reminding the Pope that he had become a French citizen, presented him with a tricolored cockade, the Holy Father smiled sadly and refused it, saying: "I know no other uniform but that with which the Church has honored me." On the 17th, when he was notified that he would leave Rome in three days, he expressed the desire to be taken toward Naples. This wish was not granted, but he was informed that he would take the road of Tuscany. In the account of Father Baldassari, a priest close to Pius VI, is the touching recital of the final separation.[78] The night of February 19 was wholly employed in the preparations for departure. The next morning the Pontiff took the Blessed Sacrament and placed it in a pyx which was suspended from his neck, as the custom is when the popes leave the Eternal City. Then, leaning on the arm of his chamberlain, Monsignor Carracciolo, he proceeded slowly to the carriage awaiting him. "God wills it," he said; "let us be ready to accept whatever Providence reserves for us." What the Directory had in reserve for him was death, death in exile.

---

[76] Consalvi, *Mémoires* (1866), II, 60–62.

[77] Gendry, II, 229.

[78] Baldassari, *Relazione de' patimenti di Pio VI.*

The Persecution in France

In France, after the lull of Thermidor, the Directory resumed (18 Fructidor, September 4, 1797) its work of persecution. This undertaking has for a long time been too much passed over. Father Rohrbacher, in his history of the Church, there devotes hardly three lines to the subject.[79] The truth is that from September 4, 1797, to November 9, 1799, almost 300 priests were deported to Guiana, where half of them died, 1,200 others were interned in the fortress of the Ile de Ré and the Ile d'Oléron, between 8,000 and 9,000 had to undergo exile or imprisonment, and 150 persons, priests and laymen, paid with their lives for the right to live in their fatherland. Such are the figures established by Victor Pierre in his scholarly work *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* patiently composed according to archival documents and studies of local history.[80]

We have seen that Larevellière-Lépaux was a sentimental utopian who fancied the establishment, in France and throughout the world, of a religion of nature and the fatherland. But in him was also another man, conceited, headstrong, fanatical, who, at the opening of the National Assembly, at once went over to the extreme left, who denied to the king the right of enclosing his domains, who, in place of the motto, "the Nation, the Law, the King," wished to have inscribed on the flags, "Liberty or Death." [81] Trembling under the Terror, hiding for two years in the neighborhood of Péronne, Larevellière rose again to power as a member of the Convention, then as a member and afterward as president of the executive Directory. This small hunch-backed man, whose long, glossy hair framed a weak and silly face, became the most unyielding and fanatical of the persecutors. He personified what was most partisan in the Directory.[82]

---

[79] Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* XXVII, 626.

[80] Pierre, *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* p. xiv.

On September 6, 1798, Larevellière, in his capacity of president of the Directory, signed the following decree: "Article 1: The persons condemned to deportation by the law of 19 Fructidor of the year V, the list of whom is here annexed, will be transferred to Cayenne. Article 2: For this purpose, at the port of Rochefort a vessel of the Republic will be put in readiness and will depart for that destination as soon as they are on board." [83] The first deportation convoy, which was directed to Guiana (September 9, 1797) had in it only one priest, Father Brotier; but the second convoy (March 12, 1798) included 155; the third (August 2), 25; and the fourth (August 9), 108. Moreover, starting with the month of May, 1798, the minister of police began to send to the Ile de Ré, opposite La Rochelle, the "deportable" individuals, and eight months later (January 17, 1799) the Directory designated the Ile d'Orléron, at the mouth of the Charente, as the place of residence for the condemned persons whose health did not permit their transfer to Guiana.

Thereafter the scenes of torture and death were in four chief places: Guiana, the Ile de Ré, the Ile d'Oléron, and continental France.

---

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[82] Larevellière was so brazen as to write in his *Mémoires* (II, 136, 141) that, beginning with 18 Fructidor, no one was disturbed and that not a single warrant was issued. But, on several thousand deportation decrees, we find his signature, written with painstaking flourishes. Cf. Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Exiles in Guiana

From the first convoy, almost entirely made up of political prisoners, 48 escaped, and only 16 reached Cayenne. Within less than a year eight of these died there. In this number was Father Brotier. Austere and reserved, Father Brotier had lavished his cares on the sick; and he won the high esteem of the blacks, who called him "father." His dying words were these: "We receive our death from the hands of the five Directors; may they enjoy this life which they are taking from us. I pardon them; may Christ likewise pardon them. May they, at their last hour, not be deprived of the presence and the consolation of their families as I am of mine." [84]

Among the 155 ecclesiastics who composed part of the second convoy, were included: 27 priests of Brittany; 13 from the Vosges, a few of whom, having taken the oath, were not legally subject to deportation, but they were actually deported; 11 from the Aisne; 8 from Cher; 10 from the Doubs, from Haute-Saône, and from the Jura (among these were three cousins, François, Denis, and Nicholas Daviot, likewise victims of the speed with which the condemned were embarked, although they were in good standing with the law); 14 from Deux-Sèvres, from the Vendée, and from Vienne; from Belgium also 14, one of them a young tonsured cleric, who was arrested and condemned in place of his brother. These ecclesiastics had as companions 38 laymen, among whom were: two members of the Council of the Five Hundred, the journalist Perlet, and the song writer Ange Pitou, who was spared by the Convention but was condemned by the Directory.

The twenty-five priests who were in the third convoy owed their freedom to an unforeseen circumstance. The ship carrying them was attacked by an English man-of-war and was forced to strike its colors; the English captain, paying homage to the innocent victims of the French Revolution, had them taken to England, where they were welcomed with warm hospitality.

---

[84] Barbé-Mabbois, *Journal d'un deporté non jugé,* I, 260; II, 17.

The last ship transporting deportees to Guiana left August 9, carrying 108 priests and 11 laymen. One of these priests, Father Brumauld de Beauregard, vicar general of Luçon, who had already seen two of his brothers put to death under the Terror, has left us some interesting memoirs of his captivity.

The climate of Guiana, the defective conditions of the lodgings assigned to the deportees, and the evil treatment inflicted on them brought about the death of a large number. "Neither table nor chair was provided in the place where they were housed. The service by the Negroes was rendered with scandalous negligence. These Negroes, as soon as they had obtained their freedom, complied with no regulation; they insulted and maltreated the sick; they bargained with the prisoners in return for money for the most indispensable cares." [85] Alas for the deceased who left no bequest! A priest of Vendée, Father Brenugat, remained three days without being buried; his fellow priests had to dig his grave with their own hands.[86]

The mortality was especially frightful beginning with the month of August, 1798, when the agent of the Directory forbade for the deportees the sojourn at Cayenne and had them distributed in the various agricultural exploitations of Guiana.

> During the following six months the deportees, exposed to the inclement weather of that distant colony, to the stifling vapors of the swamps, and to the painful toil of the fields, as also to diseases that were new to them, far removed from one another, isolated in the midst of the Negroes whose language they did not understand, have a history that is an unbroken story of their sufferings and often of their death.[87]

---

[85] Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

[86] See Ange Pitou, *Voyage à Cayenne*, II, 105.

[87] Pierre, p. 300.

That history is also the story of their zeal and their admirable virtue. In some places they had the consolation of exercising their apostolate toward the Negroes. Father Brumauld de Beauregard wrote:

> We are grouped on a little island called *Les deux Flots.* A number of Negroes who came to see our labors heard Mass. We instructed them, and they went to confession. I heard their confessions seated on an old log, where the insects were devouring both penitent and confessor. Several of the Negroes I united in marriage. Many I baptized. We taught them prayers, they sang hymns and went away contented. I entertain the hope that some of them have remained good Christians.[88]

Ange Pitou, notwithstanding his levity, and Barbé-Marbois, in spite of his revolutionary prejudices, did not conceal, in their *Mémoires,* their admiration for the good morals of the priests who were their companions of deportation. Writes Barbé-Marbois: "All those who died over there are venerated there as martyrs." Brumauld de Beauregard stresses the purity of morals which the priests preserved in an atmosphere where that virtue was but little respected. He writes:

> Amid general corruption God preserved the deportees without reproach. Not even one strayed from the laws of wisdom; more than once I had occasion to point this out to the irreligious inhabitants. Among us we had men who had not been altogether faithful to the Church; dangerous objects encompassed the deportees; but God has protected us all, and we have preached by our example the most beautiful of the virtues in a place where it is almost unknown and where the occasions of losing it are frequent.[89]

If we turn our look from the victims to the executioners, we experience a painful distress because the sight that meets our gaze is that of the most deplorable moral wretchedness.

---

[88] Brumauld de Beauregard, *Mémoires,* II, 472.
[89] *Ibid.,* II, 493.

"Whether they were carrying out instructions or whether they blamed the climate for so many hecatombs, agents of the Directory were there on the spot; they saw the prisoners die and they adopted no means and extended no aid that might testify to their humaneness." [90] And those who, from Paris, confided their mission to them, were perhaps still more guilty, for, in the inflexibility of their decrees, in the affected indifference for so many sufferings, we are not rash in seeing the effect of a fanatical hatred.[91]

The Interned Priests

Haste, negligence, disorder: these traits are what we are obliged to note in the conduct of the Directory with the unfortunates deported to Guiana. These same traits we meet with in the way of dealing with the departees of the Ile de Ré and the Ile d'Oléron.

The fortress of the Ile de Ré, built by Vauban, was magnificent. Its massiveness was imposing, its portal majestic. Entrance was by a drawbridge of prodigious breadth and length. The interior of this fortress resembled a little town. An immense courtyard was intersected by pavillons that formed several streets. The ramparts were pleasant promenades with wide and regular slopes.[92] But the devastations by the revolutionists who, to destroy the fleurs de lis of the façade, had fired on the fortress with grapeshot, and in the course of several years, the lack of repairs had made the building almost uninhabitable. At every rainfall the water poured into most of the pavillons.

Starting in May, 1798, into this fortress the minister of police sent a large number of persons judged subject to deportation. The total number of those who were there detained has been reckoned at 1,065, of whom 697 were French priests and 222 were Belgian priests.[93] All the departements of France except eight [94] were represented.

---

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 312.

[91] See in Victor Pierre the chapter entitled: "Le Directoire et les deportés," pp. 313–17.

[92] J. P. Fleury, *Mémoires,* published by Dom Piolin, p. 357.

> As at Guiana, the Directory had not ordered preparations to be made nor had the most commonplace precautions been taken for the reception or installation of the deportees. In some of the rooms the rain came through; no furniture, no beds, not even a pallet, sometimes not even straw were provided in the room. . . . Rooms twenty feet by eighteen had to accommodate twelve, fourteen, sixteen priests. Where cots were to be found, these were so crowded together that no space at all was between them. The squalid condition bred vermin. If diseases occurred, the patient was taken to the hospital, where every requisite was lacking except the nurses who, you might say, were placed there less to care for the sick than to exploit them.[95]

This fortress, which seemed intended to be a rest resort, was in reality a prison. At every moment new vexatious regulations were issued, painful forced labor, a thousand physical and moral sufferings.

Only their piety sustained these unfortunate prisoners. They attempted to group themselves, as far as they could, by dioceses or by regions; then they decided to make their spiritual exercises in common. One day Father Cholleton, the future vicar general of Lyons, having procured some vestments and sacred vessels, put an altar in a hallway and was able to say Mass there. Soon other altars were put up in the attics and lofts. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved, and the priests instituted perpetual adoration of the Eucharist. They even organized theological and scriptural conferences.

They were without a leader: the Directory sent one to them.

---

[93] Pierre, pp. 339–41.

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 341.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 344.

On February 28, 1799, to the Ile de Ré the police brought Bishop de Maille de la Tour Landry of Saint-Papoul. This man, after his military service, was early promoted to the office of vicar general of Bishop de Grimaldi of Le Mans, became bishop of Gap in 1777, and was transferred to Saint-Papoul in 1784. At first this cultured prelate astonished the people of his diocese by the considerable retinue of his house and his brilliant receptions. In his manner of life some thought to see a levity of conduct, which was probably a matter of outward habits (still a bit too unreserved) of his worldly and military life.[96] However this may be, he was one of those whose courage, zeal, and apostolic virtues showed themselves with the greatest luster during the revolutionary anguish. He was the only prelate who continued to exercise his episcopal functions during the Terror. In hiding at Passy, he there exercised his ministry and performed ordinations. Whereas his brother and his nephews perished at Paris on the scaffold, he was fortunate enough to escape the executioner. He was seen opposing the Jansenists under the Constituent, the constitutionals under the Legislative and the Convention, and, on the question of the oaths, to adopt the conciliatory principles of his friend Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice.[97] Bishop de Coucy of La Rochelle, who had occasion to oppose the ideas of Bishop de Maille regarding the oath, but who entertained lofty esteem for his virtue, eagerly confided to him all powers of jurisdiction over the deportees of the Ile and the faithful living there.

About the end of January, 1799, at the Ile de Ré the overcrowding was so great that the government designated the Ile d'Oléron to receive the new deportees. Priests to the number of 192 were transferred there. Their life, their trials, and their piety were almost the same as those of their brethren. For us to sketch the picture would be merely a repetition. The Ile de Ré and the Ile d'Oléron formed, on the coast of France, a sort of little Church, about a new kind of monastery.

---

[96] On Bishop de Maille, see De Broc, *Un évêque de l'ancien régime,* and Pisani in R. Q. H., of October, 1912.

[97] This attitude brought upon him violent opposition from the Jansenists, the Constitutionals, and a certain number of Catholics, more rigid than he was on the question of the oath, but we should note that neither the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* nor the *Annales de la religion* ever attacked his private conduct.

Thus, when the Revolution seemed to have destroyed all the religious communities on the soil of France,[98] the Directory, without intending to do so, raised new communities, equally fervent and austere, whose influence spread and whose prayers and sufferings ascended to God to obtain from His mercy the end of so many trials.

A decree of the Directory did indeed arouse among Catholics some disagreements that had already appeared on the occasion of the constitutional oath and the oath of Liberty-Equality; but a strong bond of love toward the Church and toward the Sovereign Pontiff never ceased to animate those who embraced divergent opinions. When, as we have just seen, the same prison held them, their emulation was only one of courage and self-abnegation before the sacrifice.

We allude to the oath of "hatred toward royalty and anarchy" which (September 5) the Directory had imposed on all members of the clergy.[99] Such a formula, if proposed without commentary, would doubtless have aroused a general reprobation and would have met with adamant opposition; but deputy Chollet, a member of the special commission deputed to elaborate the laws concerning the clergy, had declared, in the name of the unanimous opinion of the commission,

---

[98] Mention is made of a Trappist abbey, which the Revolution had forgotten, at Boscodon near Embrun. That was the scene of the death of De Savine, former bishop of Viviers, converted and penitent. We should recall also that on November 21, 1796, the venerable Marie Rivier had founded at Bourg-Saint-Andéol the new congregation of the Presentation of Mary and that a year later this congregation received its first ruler from a priest of St. Sulpice, Father Pontanier. Cf. F. Mourret, *La vénérable Marie Rivier,* pp. 106, 113.

[99] In the decree of September 5, 1797, article 25 was thus worded: "Ecclesiastics authorized to reside on the territory of the Republic will take the oath of hatred toward royalty and anarchy, of attachment and fidelity to the Republic and to the Constitution of the year III."

> that the person of the king was not what they were called upon to hate, since the Republic day after day signed treaties of friendship with kings; the hatred was not that of a Brutus or a Cato against everything that bore the name of king; that the hatred did not include belief in a political dogma about the best form of government; but that the ecclesiastics owed this hatred for what some were trying to re-establish in France, since the social pact rejected it and since no one could be subject to a republican constitution without rejecting every idea that would tend to overthrow it.[100]

In the presence of these explanations men were divided in mind. In many dioceses the clergy showed themselves opposed to the oath. Archbishop de Juigné of Paris, after being of this mind, abandoned it and allowed the generality of his clergy to take it. Father Emery did not take it, and was unwilling to advise others to take it; but, after learning that a certain number of priests of Paris were resigned to it, said: "Providence has permitted that they view the question from a point of view that seems to allow it to them so as to preserve for us the possession of our churches, which the different sects would assuredly have invaded." [101] The thought that the Catholic churches might be devoted to irreligious use and that all worship might be abolished, dismayed this man of God. "I cannot become used to the idea of a country without worship." [102]

This conciliatory attitude of part of the clergy did indeed permit the exercise of worship to be continued in many parishes. But vexations of all sorts were not lacking. The hate of the fanatics who wished to destroy Christianity in France was not disarmed. To grasp the depth of the malice we must, after studying the religious policy of the Directory in its measures of repression, study it in the principles of its lawmaking.

---

[100] *Moniteur,* 21 Frimaire of the year VI.

[101] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 463.

[102] *Ibid.*

Deeds of the Directory

Three words, as we have seen, sum up the conduct of the Directory with regard to the deported priests: haste, negligence, and disorder; two words suffice to characterize its legislation and its internal government: arbitrariness and tyranny. To avoid "the caprices of despotism" the Constituents had decreed the separation of the three constitutional powers: they wisely thought that the prejudices and passions of the legislator might thus be counterbalanced, if not by wisdom, at least by the contrary prejudices and passions of the representatives of the judicial power and the agents of the executive power. But the Directory concentrated in the hands of the minister of police the power of judging and the power of executing his sentences. This arrangement was a return to one of the chief abuses of the absolute monarchy, without the counterpoise of personal responsibility and the dynastic interest. The individuals who had the chief direction of the police (Sotin, Dondeau, Lecarlier, and Duval) were notable for their servility to the five directors and by their cruelty toward their victims.[103]

The police service functioned in the following manner. Upon denunciation by a commissioner of the Directory or by a private person, the minister of police had the right to arrest such a priest or such a group of priests and submit their case to an inquiry. When this investigation was finished, if the priests were charged with some specific crime, their case was referred to the criminal tribunals or, as more usually happened, to a central bureau, composed of political men who sought only to give pledges of their persecuting zeal. As for the priests against whom no precise crime could be charged, but who were supposed to be disturbers of the public tranquillity, the Directory itself retained jurisdiction of the case. It was its manner to limit arbitrary acts,[104] but it limited the arbitrariness of its tribunals only by substituting its own.

---

[103] See Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

One of the most revolting applications of this policy was the label of *"émigré"* fastened, with all its juridical consequences, upon the priests who had left France to conform to the decree of August 26, 1792. Article 1 of that decree ordered all nonjuring priests "to leave the realm within fifteen days." The act of obedience to the decree was transformed into an act of rebellion. From October, 1797, to March, 1798, bureaus functioned at Paris, Nantes, Marseilles, Besançon, Nancy, Metz, and other places, commissioned to interpret the terrible prescription in this sense. By the end of 1797 the Marseilles commission had already imprisoned at the fortress Saint-Jean nine priests, among whom was an old man of eighty years, Father Donnadieu, former director of the minor seminary. On February 23, 1798, the venerable priest, condemned to death along with a former pastor of Saint-Ferréol, Father Baudin, traversed the city, walking with firm step between his guards, in prayerful recollection. We are told that at the moment of his execution his brains burst out and that a pious girl, Marie Gouverne, gathered them up and sent them to a priest as a precious relic.[105] Father Patenaille in the Jura, Father Galmiche in the Haute-Saône, Father Nicholas at Metz, in all thirty-one priests, illegally classified as *émigrés,*[106] underwent death in the same dispositions of courage and faith. The authorities arrested as an *émigré* a priest of Tours, Jean-Joseph Glatier, who had never left the country; but the publicity which he gave to the exercise of worship and his former relations with the Chouans caused him to be regarded as a man dangerous for the Directory. Condemned to death on March 23, he was executed the next day by a firing squad along with three former soldiers of the wars of Brittany, who had been arrested with him.[107]

---

[104] *Ibid.,* p. 176.

[105] *Ibid.,* p. 148.

[106] *Ibid.,* pp. 144–61.

Victor Pierre estimates at 1,756 the number of French priests who were reached by the decree of the Directory. If we reflect that the clergy of France had just been decimated by the executions of the Terror and by exile, this figure appears considerable. Conjecture has been made that it represents a fourth of the priests then living in France.[108] Moreover, the persecution extended to all parts of the country. Out of eighty-nine departments, barely two or three were entirely exempt from it.[109]

The Persecution in Belgium

The persecution passed beyond the old frontiers into Belgium, which had been recently annexed and divided into several departements designated as "reunited departements." [110]

As soon as Belgium was turned over to the hands of the proconsuls of the Republic, at the time of the Convention, that country was administered after the manner of France. There the Committee of Public Safety organized committees of surveillance; the scaffold was paraded from city to city; the Belgian Terror even survived for six months after the death of Robespierre.

The Directory wished to oblige the Belgian clergy to take all the oaths prescribed for the French priests. The Belgian priests en masse refused to take any of these oaths. In them a feeling of national independence was joined to apprehensions which their religious faith dictated to them. Louvain, the seat of the great Catholic university, gave the signal of resistance. On

---

[107] Piolin, *L'église du Mans sous la Révolution,* III, 441–50.

[108] Pierre, *op. cit.,* p. 253.

[109] *Ibid.*

[110] Decree of September 30, 1795.

October 9, 1797, Cardinal Frankenberg, archbishop of Malines, was arrested and deported beyond the Rhine. On the 28th the University of Louvain was suppressed; its library, its archives, its physics laboratory, and its botanical garden, all were confiscated by the Directory; and on November 8, an order was given to the central bureaus to draw up a list of all the priests living in their jurisdiction.

The agitation began to reach the people, who resorted to all ruses to safeguard their priests and their worship. As in France, non-juring priests were forbidden to exercise their ministry. But they celebrated Mass in private houses before sunrise. In some neighborhoods people passed over the frontier, and certain localities where Catholic worship was celebrated became for the Belgians as places of pilgrimage.

Then against the priests, who were accused of being "instigators of disorder" and "sowers of discord," appeared individual and collective arrests. Soon rumblings, precursors of an approaching explosion, were heard; people spoke of a "new Vendée"; the collective arrests increased in number: on 17 Nivôse (January 6, 1798) sixty priests were arrested for having "inspired hatred toward the republican government and for having gathered their followers together during the night with a view to evade the surveillance of the constituted authorities"; [111] on 14 Pluviôse (February 2), a collective decree was issued against twenty-nine priests, charging simply "their fanatical doctrine and their anti-revolutionary principles." [112] At bottom, the government was prosecuting in these priests the patriots no less than the defenders of the faith. They were endeavoring to check at the start a revolt that was ready to break forth.

The affair exploded on November 28, 1798. The city government of Brussels had given notice of the immediate call of

---

[111] Decree of September 30, 1795.

[112] *Ibid.*

200,000 conscripts to the colors. The young men thus called refused to present themselves; liberty poles were cut down, and placards containing vigorous protests were posted. Soon the movement spread into the county districts. On October 17, at Remich, fifty young men armed with stout clubs cried: "Long live the king," and refused to break up. Two days later, at Saint-Vith, 1,500 in revolt, coming in three columns, seized and strangled the commissioner. On October 28, at Malmedy, the number of revolters was 3,000. The situation was like a new Vendée, but the strife did not assume the same proportions.

This struggle does not lend itself to a methodical account. It was a series of separate combats, of skirmishes, and of sudden attacks. No properly so-called battle took place nor was a plan of campaign followed. But the struggle had two marks: one, we regret to have to say, was the cruelty of the victors who often shot the conquered after the fight; the other consisted of combats apparently decisive but in reality not conclusive.[113] Finally the insurgents were unable to withstand the war-hardened troops that were sent in large numbers from France to fight them; the conclusion of this campaign was the unheard-of decree, issued on November 4, 1798, and signed by Larevellière-Lépeaux, condemning to deportation all priests who had taken the oath.[114] This monstrous proscription affected about a thousand priests. Many succeeded in eluding their persecutors at the price of countless alarms and dangers; many were deported to France and were there mingled with the French priests, from whom history can no longer distinguish them.

Motive of the Persecution

Anyone who has perused the long series of decrees passed by the Directory and the orders issued by the minister of police against the priests of France and Belgium, cannot fail to make a certain reflection. The three leading complaints appealed to against the priests are the refusal to take the oath, the so-called emigration, and the antirevolutionary propaganda. Yet we get the impression that such were not the real motives of the persecution. Whenever a priest showed a true zeal for religion, even if he had never left France and had taken all the constitutional oaths and had ostensibly separated from the royalist party, he was prosecuted, judged, and condemned. All these facts suggest the idea that the government under Larevellière-Lépeaux had but one aim: to replace the Christian religion by the natural and civic religion which this ardent disciple of Rousseau took under his protection. This conjecture becomes a certitude when we study the conduct of the Directory toward the constitutional clergy.

---

[113] Pierre, *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* p. 241.

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 248.

The constitutional priests enthusiastically took all the oaths. Their leader, Grégoire, made their apology and was the one who inspired them. The republican ideas counted no adherents more fervent than these men, who always condemned the emigration as a laxity and a betrayal. However, they did not escape the persecutions by the Directory.

In fact, many of those who took their stand about the Bishop of Loir-et-Cher continued the exercise of the ecclesiastical office, said Mass, preached and heard confessions, with a regularity and seriousness that rendered difficult for anyone to distinguish between their ministry and that of the non-juring priests. The revolutionary utopia which lured them from the path of obedience to the pope, and the weakness or ambition which led them to bow before the civil authority, did not contaminate their Christian faith. This quality was reason enough for the Directory to hold them as suspect. They were charged "with having taken the oath only that they might conspire with the greater boldness," "with having, under the shelter of their oaths, continued their maneuvers against the safety of the Republic." Such were the headings of accusation brought against a former subprior of the Trappist monastery of Mortagne (Father Magnier), against Goury-Lay and Vaillant of Cher, and against Debeaussard and Hugues of Eure. Father Druyer, the constitutional pastor of Serville in the Eure-et-Loir, in vain offered the authentic list of his oaths and the testimonials of his parishioners in support of his fidelity to the Republic; he was judged and condemned. Father Marcepoil, the pastor of Isle-en-Dodon, published several writings in favor of the oaths; Father Zabée, a juring priest of the Ardennes, was even conspicuous by the intemperance of his republicanism. All these favorable circumstances were of no avail. Since they remained faithful to their parochial ministry, they embarrassed the policy of the Directory; they were deported.

In the eyes of Larevellière and his friends, the guilt of these priests was the greater when, in the exercise of their pastoral functions, they added the refusal to take part in the decadaire feasts. We would doubtless be exaggerating to call this attitude, as Grégoire did, "a sublime resistance" and to say that "the decadaire feasts were for the constitutional clergy the era of the martyrs." [115] Victor Pierre remarks: "If the constitutional clergy had been as numerous and as disposed for martyrdom as some would have us believe, they would have furnished more victims to the persecution; but they formed among the deportees an inconsiderable minority. . . . Only twenty constitutional priests are to be found in Guianna, eighty at the Ile de Ré." [116] Two juring bishops were prosecuted by the Directory. Mandru, of the Vosges, was charged with having spread a synodical letter of the national council of France, which appeared in September, 1797, and which criticized "the dry and bombastic teaching of the republican schools"; but he was sentenced merely to a fine of 100 francs and imprisonment for six months; the minister of the interior considered "that we should not apply to him the law of 19 Fructidor for the reason that the refractory priests, even more dangerous than the others, derived from that rigor a subject of victory." The same was not true in the case of Le Coz, constitutional bishop of Ille-et-Vilaine, charged with having, in writing, attacked the substitution of the decadi for the Sunday. The charge was dropped since it might end in a condemnation that would be a triumph for the enemies of the Directory.[117]

---

[115] Grégoire, *Histoire des sectes religieuses,* I, 323–40; II, 453; *Annales de la religion,* June 3, 1797.

[116] Pierre, pp. 213, 216.

Sacking of Rome

At bottom the enemy, so they considered, was especially Roman Catholicism. Toward that enemy no considerations should be entertained, no indulgence; but the law must always be interpreted in the narrowest sense, always applied in its most cruel rigor. This policy appears in the brutality of the proceedings used against the Papal States and against the very person of the Supreme Pontiff.

When Pius VI, led away by the emissaries of the Directory, had left Rome (February 20, 1798), the Eternal City was at once given over to methodical pillage. In an official memorandum of July 25, 1796, we read: "The fanaticism must be destroyed; but the popes' spiritual power rests particularly on their temporal power, on the revenues which they receive therefrom." [118] General Berthier, who needed money to pay his troops, deduced the consequences of this reasoning in seizing the goods of the Holy See. On March 25 the lands which Duke Braschi had purchased in the Pontine Marshes were confiscated; On April 6, 9, and 10, they were sold. All the furniture of Pius VI that was found in his palace of Terracina was treated in like manner. A band of commissioners invaded the Vatican and the Quirinal and pillaged them.[119] When, at Paris, the Jacobins learned that the Papal States were invaded and that the pontifical government was overthrown, they rushed there to grab a share in the booty. Berthier by means of several decrees tried to halt them, but in vain. Massens, his successor as commander of the troops, was no more successful.[120] Even the consuls, officially charged with maintaining order, with the help of the French commissioners,[121] had not been in power six months when public rumor accused them of the worst exactions. The *Moniteur,* in its number of September 12, gave wide publicity to these charges. Visconti pilfered the medals of the Bracciano Museum; Angelucci, who but lately did not have a franc to his name, was buying extensive properties; Matteis was speculating on the sale of the notes; Reppi was paying his debts and increasing his capital, no one knew how; Panazzi displayed for sale the precious jewels of the Bambino stolen at Ara Coeli.[122]

---

[117] *Archives nationales,* F^7 7398.

[118] *Affaires étrangères, Mem. et doc.,* XII, 56, cited by Albert Dufourcq, *Le régime jacobin en Italie* (1900), p. 567.

Amid these disturbances many Romans left the city. Several cardinals judged the situation intolerable; only thirteen of them stayed in Rome. Eight of them were arrested, imprisoned, then deported.[123] Two shamefully abandoned the Holy Father, abdicated the cardinalitial dignity, and handed it over into the hands of the commander-in-chief of the French troops. These men were cardinals Altieri and Antici. The latter had received the purple only at the pressing request of the King of Prussia and the King of Poland. Crushed with grief and for a while hesitant about what measure he should take, Pius VI, by two briefs of September 7, 1798, declared that the two cardinals had forfeited their office and that they were thereafter deprived of any active or passive voice in the future conclave.[124] These two briefs were dated from the Chartreuse of Florence, where the Pontiff had arrived on June 2, 1798, after a three months' sojourn at Sienna and after there writing for the courts of Europe a solemn protest against the outrages that had been inflicted on him.

---

[119] Gendry, II, 329.

[120] *Ibid.,* p. 337.

[121] The Directory (March 20, 1798) had solemnly installed on the Capitol twelve consuls. During the festival, invocation was made to the "manes of the Emilies and the Scipios." *Ibid.,* p. 135.

[122] *Ibid.,* p. 341.

[123] *Ibid.,* p. 309.

In this retreat, where he stayed two months, Pius VI, notwithstanding the decline of his health and the hateful surveillance exercised over him, engaged actively in the general interests of the Church. Two particularly important letters were dated at the Chartreuse of Florence. One (January 30, 1799) was aimed at the professors of the Sapienza who had taken the oath of "hatred for royalty and anarchy," prescribed by article 377 of the Roman Constitution. These professors had formed their consciences on a simple declaration of the magistrate commissioned to receive this oath. This magistrate had assured them that the oath did not oblige them to anything beyond abstaining from any conspiracy against the Roman Republic. "Although we know," said the Pope, "that the words of an oath must be understood in the sense intended by the person who requires it, the verbal declaration which the said professors made before the magistrate charged with receiving their oath, could not change its substance; no one but the lawmaker is its interpreter, not the simple magistrate delegated to obtain the material execution of the law." [125]

---

[124] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

[125] Picot, *Mémoires,* VII, 218. Father Emery in several letters and especially in an article which he published in 1800 (*Annales philosophiques,* I, 155) held that the lawfulness of the oath of hatred prescribed in France, if taken in the sense of Chollet's explanations, was confirmed rather than brought into doubt by the brief of January 30, 1799. For, he says, if by this brief the Pope reproved the oath taken by the professors of the Sapienza, this rebuke was because a magistrate, charged with the material execution of a law, was not qualified to give it an interpretation different from its apparent meaning. Hence, Father Emery concludes, if the explanations had been given, as in France, by the lawmaker himself, the Holy Father would probably not have taken exception to the oath. Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 414.

The other papal document, likewise dated from Florence, is more important. It is a constitution regulating the holding of the next conclave. For a long time past, this eventuality was one of the chief concerns of Pius VI. By two bulls (December 29, 1796, and February 11, 1797), with a view to assuring the tranquillity of the future conclave, he derogated from the traditional rules.[126] A constitution dated November 13, 1798, provided that at the Pontiff's death the right of election should belong to the largest group of cardinals gathered together in the states of a Catholic prince and to all those who wished to join this group. The cardinals would have the right to determine the place of the conclave and to regulate whatever concerned the future election. All the censures imposed by Paul II on those who should concern themselves with a future papal election, were abrogated.[127]

At Rome, however, the revolutionaries, not satisfied with pillaging and persecuting, tried, as in France, to replace Catholic worship with civil ceremonies. On November 17, 1798, in Piazza d'Espagna, a huge amphitheater had been erected, with these inscriptions: "Reason triumphs over pride," "humanity triumphs over tyranny," "truth rises from the ashes of superstition." In the amphitheater, in the presence of the consuls, senators, and pretors of the Roman Republic, the eldest of the Borghese princes and the prince of Santa Cruce burned the golden book of the nobility and the bull of St. Pius V creating the tribunal of the Inquisition.

This action, too violent a wound to the Catholic faith of the Italian people and their traditional attachment to their old customs, exasperated a populace already greatly irritated against the demands and the depradations of the French. In February, 1798, an uprising of the people of Trastevere had been stifled in blood. The Romans now loudly called for the

---

[126] Gendry, II, 325, 484.

[127] *Ibid.*, p. 327.

Neapolitan armies, hoping that these would bring deliverance. On October 28 the king of the Two Sicilies, Ferdinand IV, in answer to this appeal, addressed to the French an order to evacuate the papal territory; on November 14, from his headquarters at San Germano, he published a proclamation to the Roman people. When General Championnet, commander of the French forces at Rome, did not reply to the order of the King of Naples, General Mack, commander-in-chief of the Neapolitan troops, opened the hostilities.

Immediately the people of Rome again rose up. Championnet, not having a force large enough to fight against an internal uprising and at the same time against the army of Mack then threatening him, abandoned the city of Rome, which (November 29) opened its gates to the King of Naples. An edict of December 3 invited the inhabitants to have full confidence in His Sicilian Majesty. But the peace was of short duration. The French army, reinforced by new troops, turned back toward Rome, met the Neapolitan forces before the walls of Civita Castellana, completely routed them, and, passing through Rome at full gallop, seized Naples on January 23, 1799.

Pius VI in France

Upon learning of these events, the Pope was apprehensive. He feared that the Directory might make them a pretext for taking more severe measures against his person and against the Church.[128] He judged rightly. On March 26 two French officers came to the Chartreuse in Florence and informed him of the order that he must proceed to Parma without delay.[129] He had to leave two days later (March 28) at three o'clock in the morning. The Pontiff, whose health was notably weakened, had not yet recovered from the fatigue of the journey when (April

---

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 351.

[129] *Ibid.*, p. 406.

13) a dispatch instructed the Pope's guards to transfer him at once to Turin, where he arrived at night, exhausted. There he was informed that the goal of his journey was France. Raising his eyes to heaven, he said: "I will go wherever they purpose taking me." In the evening of the 30th, after a painful and perilous crossing of the Alps, he set foot on French soil. Perhaps he then recalled the touching words he had uttered in his allocution in the consistory of June 17, 1793: "France, France, that our predecessors called the model of Catholic unity, the unshakable prop of the faith, thou that surpassed the other nations by thy zeal and thy devotion to the Apostolic See, how different thou hast become!" [130]

The sight of the august victim along his route would awaken in many consciences sentiments of faith until then slumbering.

> In vain would anyone try to recognize in this old man, led by fifty horsemen, the majestic pontiff whom the Austrian populace had admired seventeen years before. An attack of paralysis had deprived him of the use of his legs, and his brow, under a crown of white hair, bore the weight of almost eighty-two years. Nevertheless his sufferings and the cruel infirmities to which he was condemned did not disturb the serenity of his spirit; in his captivity he had preserved the full liberty of his soul and the full energy of his heart.[131]

In a brief to the bishops of France (November 10, 1793) he wrote: "What have we to fear? Death? No, indeed. When we live only for Jesus Christ, we can merely gain by leaving this life." [132]

In the midst of his sufferings, the Pontiff had the sweetest consolations that can touch the soul of a representative of Jesus Christ. At Briançon, in the midst of a throng of people who had come from the surrounding country to greet him on his journey, with tears in his eyes he repeated the words of the Master: "Amen I say to you, I have not found so great faith in Israel." At Savine a noble lady dressed in mourning knelt at his feet, begging him to bless her and bestow on her the peace she had lost since the schism of her son. She was the marquise of Savine, mother of the former constitutional bishop of Viviers.[133] At Gap, the constitutional pastor of the cathedral, Father Escallier, begged the Pope to grant him absolution for his apostasy.

---

[130] Barberi, *Bullarium*, IX, 327.

[131] A. M. de Franclieu, *Pie VI dans les prisons du Dauphiné.*

[132] Guillon, *Brefs et institutions de Pie VI relatifs à la Révolution française* (1798), II, supplement, p. 52.

Pius VI reached Valence on July 14, 1799. As his residence he was assigned the citadel of the city. As soon as he was brought to his apartments, the outer doors were closed, and he was declared to be "in the state of arrest." [134] The citadel had a chapel where the Pope had the consolation of hearing Mass every day. "The Holy Father," says Baldassari, "each morning recited the canonical hours, ordinarily heard two Masses, made long and fervent prayers to the Holy Trinity, to our Lord, to St. Peter. . . . Toward evening he recited the Rosary with us." [135] From his prison he followed the affairs of Rome and of the whole Church. News of the victories of Suvorov gave him some hope for an amelioration of the religious situation. The contrary is what happened. The French government, concerned with the progress of the Austro-Russian army, decided (July 25, 1799) that the Pope, "regarded as a hostage," should be removed to a point remote from the frontier.[136] The executive Directory decreed, "The late Pope will be transferred from Valence to Dijon." At the foot of this decree Pius VI had the sadness to read the name of an apostate priest, Sieyès.

But the paralysis from which the Pope was suffering for a considerable time, reached the intestines; the ailment progressed rapidly. The doctors judged that his transfer would be im-

[133] M. de Savine was converted eight years later.

[134] Gendry, II, 417.

[135] Baldassari, *Relation sur l'enlèvement et la captivité de Pie VI,* IV, f. 212.

[136] Letter of the minister of the interior, cited by Franclieu, *op. cit.,* p. 178.

possible. The commissioner, Curnier, wrote: "Is it not the policy of the French government to preserve this important hostage as long as it can?"[137]

On August 28, 1799, the sick man's condition was such that he received the sacrament of extreme unction. His last words, spoken with difficulty but in a fully intelligible voice, were these: *"Domine, ignosce illis"* ("Lord, forgive them").[138] That night, at about midnight, during the prayers for those in their last agony, the Pope, raising his arm, with a triple sign of the cross blessed the persons present; then his hand fell back lifeless, letting the crucifix which he was holding fall. Pius VI was dead. He was the most august and last victim of the French Revolution.

---

[137] Franclieu, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

[138] The following words are also reported: "Recommend to my successor that he pardon the French as I pardon them with all my heart." Gendry, II, 424.

PART III

TOWARD A RELIGIOUS RESTORATION

POPE PIUS VI died in exile. Viewed superficially, this disaster, following so many others, marked the final fall of the papacy before the triumphant Revolution. Three years later, however, the man who had been sent to Rome "to extinguish the torch of fanaticism" did in fact treat with the Supreme Pontiff about the re-establishment of Catholic worship. The people most enamored of the subversive doctrines of the *Contrat social* and the *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard* now had a taste of the Catholic poetry of the *Genius of Christianity*. The sons of the kings who had expelled the Jesuits, who had patronized the philosophers and backed the Jansenists, became champions of a Catholicism thoroughly devoted to the Roman pontiff. Shortly afterward, some philosophers, Joseph de Maistre and Bonald, Ballanche and Lamennais, though following different tendencies, were outlining the plan of a society with Christianity as its basis. Writers and artists found their inspirations in the ages of faith. This immense effort toward a religious restoration was not, moreover, limited to France; Germany and England took part in it. But the result was not without a mixture of errors, or without painful shocks. The very first quarter of the nineteenth century would see Gallicanism come to life again with Napoleon, and liberalism appear with Lamennais. In the face of these obstacles and errors, Pius VII would begin the long struggle which Gregory XVI and Pius IX zealously continued.

CHAPTER VII

The Religious Situation in 1799

CHATEAUBRIAND, on his return from exile, described France in a few picturesque lines.

> You might say that a conflagration had passed through the villages. . . . To the right and left of the highway appeared ruined castles and mansions. Of their destroyed old forests nothing remained but a few sawed-off stumps on which children were playing. You would see enclosure walls with gaps in them, abandoned churches from which the dead had been driven out, church towers without bells, cemeteries without crosses, headless and battered statues of saints in their niches. On the walls could be seen already worn-out republican inscriptions: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity or Death. In some places an attempt had been made to erase the word "Death," but the black or red letters were visible under the coat of whitewash. This nation, which at the moment seemed to be dissolving, was again beginning in the world, like people emerging from death or from the barbarism and destruction of the Middle Ages.[1]

This picture might be enlarged. The conquests of the Revolution had, indeed, extended its work of religious destruction. In the Batavian, Cisalpine, Helvetic, Roman, and Neapolitan republics, successively established between 1795 and 1799 in Holland, Milan, Switzerland, Rome, and Naples, the revolutionary oaths had been imposed under severe penalties, many faithful priests had been banished, churches had been pillaged; in places where the armies of the Revolution had not penetrated, at least its ideas were triumphant.

The revolutionary irreligion had spread even outside of

---

[1] *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* II, 235.

Europe. The ruin of the Society of Jesus, which in 1775 counted 16,000 missioners, inflicted a disastrous blow on the foreign missions; the spoliation of the possessions of the Church by the Constituent Assembly wiped out the resources of the clergy; the suppression of monasteries and the persecution of the priests dried up the sources of vocations. The attempt in 1792 and 1793 to impose the constitutional oath on the missioners of India forced a large number of them to abandon the field of their apostolate.[2] The Directory, going even beyond this, in 1796 backed the nabob of Mysore, Tippo Sahib, who was persecuting the Christians. Some Jacobins, coming to Mysore, there founded clubs in which was decreed "the destruction of all tyrants except the citizen prince Tippo the Victorious, the friend of the French Republic, its close cousin." [3]

At Rome itself, the very center of Christianity, religion was not secure. At the time of Pius VI's death, the city was evacuated by the French army, but the Sacred College had been obliged to disperse. Most of the cardinals fled to Venice. In that city of lagoons, in a Benedictine monastery on St. George island, they met in conclave to choose a new head for the Church.

What seemed to complete the decay of Catholicism was the evident favor enjoyed by its enemies: the Protestants, the Jews, the Freemasons, and the atheists.

The Protestants

During the French Revolution, Protestantism, according to the expression of one of its historians, "had gone ahead firmly and rapidly." [4] The edict of November, 1787, gave the Protestants their civil status; and for more than ten years the Huguenot Necker exercised a considerable influence in the conduct of political and financial affairs. The salon of his wife was the most frequented meeting place of authors, publishers, and notable foreigners. A law of December 24, 1789, assured the Protestants of the exercise of all political rights. A few months later the Constituent Assembly raised to the presidency the Protestant pastor Rabaut Saint-Etienne. After that the Assembly gave the Protestants fresh pledges of its good will.[5] By a decree of July 20, 1790, it restored to them all property confiscated from their ancestors for religious reasons. By another decree (December 16, 1790) it granted all rights of French citizenship to the descendants of the refugees on condition that they return to France and there take the civic oath. Following this last legislative act, numerous Protestants came from abroad, established themselves in France, and soon exercised a great influence there. Of this number was Benjamin Constant, then twenty-three years old. Under the different governments, even to the monarchy of Louis Philippe, he would defend, in politics and in religion, the most individualist liberalism, and he would exert a considerable influence on public opinion, as also on the progress of state affairs.

---

[2] In 1793 Bishop Champenois of French India was expelled for refusing to assist at the planting of a liberty tree.

[3] A. Mazon. *Un missionaire vivarais aux Indes, l'abbé Dubois,* p. 10.

[4] G. de Felice, *Histoire des protestants de France,* p. 580.

The Jews

Political favor came to the Protestants without any exertion on their part. But the Jews had to win it by main force. In August, 1789, a deputation of Alsatian Jews presented themselves at the bar of the Assembly to appeal for the emancipation of their fellow Jews. This step led to the presentation of a project rehabilitating the four classes of persons who at that time did not enjoy civil rights: the Protestants, the actors, the hangmen, and the Jews. But the Assembly merely voted the rehabilitation of the Protestants, the actors, and the hangmen. It refused the same consideration to the Jews, who it knew were organized and powerful, and whom it considered politically formidable. Rewell and Maury became the interpreters of these fears. During the discussion a deputy declared: "You are opening the doors of France, not to individuals, but to a nation."

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 588.

The Jews, however, were not discouraged. In their number were some persons of intelligence. Henrietta Hertz, the friend of Mirabeau, was a Jew,[6] and the sect of the Martinists, made up almost exclusively of Jews, had just fused with Freemasonry. Most of the speakers in the parliamentary debate who were heard in favor of the Jews were Freemasons.[7] In 1791 the Jews of Paris resolutely took the direction of the affair. They were not numerous, hardly five hundred, who used to meet faithfully in the synagogue on rue Brisemiche.[8] But they were generally quite advanced in modern ideas and were closely connected with the philosophers. Their leader, the banker Cerfbeer, who later put his financial experience in the service of Napoleon, had made influential friends. At the session of January 18, 1791, Duke de Broglie accused him of spending large sums in Paris to win over the defenders of his cause.[9] But money was not the only means used. The Paris sections had become a power. Men made the rounds of the capital's sixty sections, suggesting petitions, stimulating steps to be taken. The result of this agitation was a popular demonstration on September 27, 1791, the day before the final adjournment of the Assembly. Under the pressure of this manifestation the members of the Assembly declared that the Jews would enjoy in France the rights of active citizens.[10]

---

[6] Lémann, *La préponderance juive,* I, 146.

[7] Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes,* Vol. II, Bk. II, chap. 6.

[8] Lémann, *op. cit.,* p. 175.

[9] *Moniteur,* January 20, 1791.

[10] *Ibid.,* September 29, 1791.

The Freemasons

At the very time when the Jews thus entered upon the enjoyment of French citizenship, the Freemasons were already influential in France. We have seen the part played by the lodges in the upper society of the ancient regime. At first the Revolution favored their cohesion. Rebold, a Freemason historian, writes: "The Revolution did more in the interest of Masonic unity than all the combined efforts of the Grand Orient." [11] In 1789, thanks to subsidies from the Duke of Orleans, the "club de propagande" was founded. This club was destined to overthrow all the established governments, paying the traveling expenses of missioners, who were called "apostles." [12] Lodges were to be found in 292 cities. Condorcet, Danton, Chénier, and Rabaut Saint-Etienne might be seen in the lodge of the "Nine Sisters"; Lafayette, Laclos, and Dr. Guillotin, in the lodge of "Candor." But the most active group was the Breton Club, which became the club of the Jacobins and set up branches throughout France. Apart from its public meetings, it held secret sessions open only to the initiated.[13]

Beginning in 1792, the Masonic influence was eclipsed. As Rebold states, the society had to act with much caution.[14] The violent factions that split the Legislative Assembly and the Convention prevented any common action, and all initiative became risky. The Duke of Orleans published (February 22, 1793) in the *Journal de Paris* his resignation as grand master of the order. "I joined Freemasonry," he said, "because it offered me a sort of image of equality. I have since quit the phantom for the reality." [15] Consequently three months later the office of grand master was declared vacant, and for several years the Grand Orient remained quiescent. But in 1799 Freemasonry realized a more solid direction than any that had been attempted up to that time. This improved condition was the work of an active and intelligent person, Roettiers de Montaleau, who was employed in grouping the Masonic forces into a single fasces. His efforts ended (May 23, 1799) in the agreement that united the former grand lodge of France and the Grand Orient, which thereby found itself invested with unquestioned authority.

---

[11] Rebold, *Histoire des trois grandes loges,* p. 88.

[12] G. Gautherot, in *Dictionnaire apologetique de la foi catholique,* under the word *Franc-Maçonnerie,* II, 106.

[13] Gautherot, *op. cit.,* col. 107.

[14] Rebold, *op. cit.,* p. 82.

[15] *Ibid.*

Protestantism, Judaism, and Freemasonry had not exhausted the favors of the Directory. The "philosophy" had its share. We know what was understood by "philosophy" in 1799. From Rousseau to Cabanis the sense of this word had undergone a radical change. The author of *Emile* still paid homage to Christ; Mirabeau professed at least faith in God. In 1791, during the discussion on the Declaration of the Rights of Man he declared: "God is as necessary for man as liberty." But for Volney, Cabanis, Lakanal, Naigeon, and Lalande, to be a philosopher was to deny the existence of God and the spirituality of the soul, to profess atheism and materialism. These very men, all of them, were members of the Institute, founded (October 27, 1795) to gather together the most eminent persons of France.

Vitality of Catholicism

In 1799, at the time of Pius VI's death, the Catholic Church, either by the official discredit heaped on it or by the favors accorded to its adversaries, appeared condemned to inevitable decay. But the reality was quite otherwise. To the eye of a close observer, atheism, Freemasonry, Judaism, and Protestantism, outwardly triumphant, were inwardly enfeebled and their strength sapped, whereas Catholicism, officially proscribed, was animated by an intrinsic and mighty vitality.

Nowhere was the weakness of atheism more evident than at the time of the competition opened in 1796 by the Institute on the means for founding a system of morality among the people. All the competitors naturally treated the subject in the spirit of their judges. The two reports by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre (July 3, 1798) and by Guinguené (January 5, 1800) showed the void in all those programs from which the thought of God was systematically excluded. The memorial that Guinguené thought superior to all the others proposed as a basis of virtue the equality of possessions, a just balance between our needs and our possessions. The others proposed to found a journal of good deeds, to oblige everyone to cultivate the field of the widow, the aged, and the orphan, to erect in the public squares statues to the honor of virtuous men (Orestes, Pylades, Sully, Montaigne, and La Boétie), to institute a court of morals, made up of wise old men. "On reading these proposals we should remember that they came from the minds of serious men, some of whom have left a name in history, such as Destutt de Tracy and John Baptist Say. We cannot help wondering whether they needed to take the trouble to declaim so much against Christian morals, only to arrive at such a shipwreck of common sense." [16]

Freemasonry was unable to attain a higher ideal. It had reached the worship of the Supreme Being; but gradually its doctrines were fused with those of the philosophers and underwent the same evolution. Condorcet even restricted the part of Masonry to supplementing the philosophical proselytism, and basically the union which the Grand Orient had just realized between the different lodges in 1799 was more artificial than real, or at least more suited to a work of destruction than to a positive undertaking of moral and social reconstruction. The weakly servile character of this society would make it bow to the absolute power of Napoleon with such baseness that it even flattered both the aristocracy of the ancient regime and the demagogic passions of the Revolution.

---

[16] Sicard, *A la recherche d'une religion civile,* p. 270.

In their rise to power, the Jews were obliged to follow the same path. The Paris synagogue had won its influence only by its relations with the philosophers and the Jacobins; and thenceforth, by the rendering of public services, it took precedence over the other religious groups, some of which, such as that of Alsace, remained more attached to the old beliefs. Generally in the Jewish world Lessing's rationalist criticism prevailed over the sentimental deism of Mendelssohn.

The ruin of the traditional faith, like the development of the political influence, was more felt among the Protestants. Necker's daughter, Madame de Staël, and her friend Benjamin Constant, at that time represented in the intellectual domain the Protestant thought, as Lessing represented the Jewish thought. They had so greatly moderated Calvin's doctrines by those of Voltaire and Rousseau that their religion was reduced to what the Duke de Broglie called "a pietistic latitudinarianism," a vague belief which accommodated its dogmas to suit all religions and all philosophies.[17]

At bottom, if in this last year of the eighteenth century, people wished to find a real moral and religious force, they must look for it in Catholicism, flouted by the philosophers of the ancient regime, stripped of its possessions, persecuted in its ministers, and replaced in its worship by the Revolution.

Popular Feelings

No one has perceived and analyzed the elements of this force in a more penetrating way than the author of the *Origins of Contemporary France*. Says Taine:

---

[17] "Madame de Staël has the soul of Rousseau; but by the spirit of her mind she is the daughter of Voltaire; the religion of the time is her religion" (Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 864).

Thanks to the Revolution, the uneducated or uncritical Catholics had acquired the feeling of the binding force by which in their Church the liturgy, the hierarchy, and the statement of dogma were united to the inner religious life. Never did they ask themselves how orthodoxy differs from schism, or how positive religion is opposed to natural religion. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy is what makes them distinguish the non-juring pastor from the intruder, and the good Mass from the bad Mass; the prohibition of the Mass is what made them understand the importance of the Mass; the revolutionary government is what turned them into theologians and canonists.

Under the Terror they were obliged to sing and dance around the goddess of Reason, then in the temple of the Supreme Being, having been subjected, under the Directory, to the novelties of the republican calendar and the insipidity of the decadaire feasts. Thus they had measured with their own eyes the distance separating a present, personal, incarnate, redeeming, and saving God from a non-existing or vague deity and, in any event, an absent God. They saw the difference between a living, immemorial, revealed religion and an abstract, artificial religion; between their spontaneous worship, their act of faith, and the imposed religion, a mere cold, outward show. They saw their priest in surplice, vowed to continence, delegated from on high to open for them infinite perspectives of paradise or hell, and the republican celebrant, in tricolor scarf, more or less married, delegated from Paris to give them a course of lessons in Jacobin morals. By this very contrast, the people became more attached to their clergy, to all their clergy, secular and regular.

Pastors and prelates, religious men and women, the people had seen suffer for their faith, which was that of the people. In the presence of the clergy's constancy, equal to that of the traditional martyrs, the people's lukewarmness changed to an attitude of respect. . . . Seeing the clergy without bread, without a roof, imprisoned, deported, everyone at least a fugitive and hunted out, the people, during the persecutions of the year IV and the year VI, had received them, hid them, and fed them. . . . Each morning the man or the woman of the people passed some of those buildings that had been sequestered from their religious use. By their form and their name they loudly proclaimed what they had been, what today they would become again. . . . The

> solemnities, the big feasts, and the Sundays were lacking; and this lack was a periodic privation for their ears and their eyes; they regretted the absence of the ceremonies, candles, chants, the sound of the church bells, the morning and evening angelus. Their heart and their feelings had remained Catholic and longed for their Church of former days.[18]

We may add that their heart and soul had become more Roman. The events of the Revolution had taught them this need. They knew certain truths, that, if the sacraments necessary for their religious life must be conferred on them by a priest, this priest, marked with a unique and indelible character, had to be ordained by a lawful bishop and that this bishop was not lawful unless he himself had been instituted by the pope. Consequently without the pope, no bishops; without the bishops, no priests; without priests, no sacraments; without the sacraments, no salvation,[19] or at least, salvation rendered incomparably harder.

Hence in the districts where the non-juring priests had been able to remain or to return, the people flocked to their Mass and were unwilling to accept any other. Hence also, in places besides the Vendée, the people rose up against government agents who were depriving them of their public worship. Often, indeed, these people went beyond the bounds of lawful defense. Beginning in 1799, from Marseilles to Lyons, along both banks of the Rhone, the revolt went on for five years. Royalist bands, swollen by refractory conscripts and favored by the populace that humored them, slew and pillaged the agents of the Republic and those who acquired national properties. In August, 1799, 16,000 insurgents of Haute-Garonne and of the six neighboring departments, led by the Count de Paulo, unfurled the white flag. In more than thirty departments intermittent and scattered Vendées occurred. All the Catholic departments had their latent Vendées.[20]

[18] Taine, *Les origines de la France contemporaine,* X, 43–49.

[19] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 42.

[20] Cf. *ibid.,* IX, 164–66.

Switzerland

Several of the countries conquered by the Revolution had offered similar resistance to its interference in the domain of the faith. After Belgium, the Catholic cantons of Switzerland rose up. They were to the number of seven: Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucern, Zug, Solothurn, and Fribourg. Peopled by poor and hard-working peasants, their constitution had a more democratic character than that of the rich, Protestant cantons, such as Bern and Zurich, which were ruled by a well-to-do aristocracy. However, Church property was considerable in these cantons, and it aroused the eager cupidity of the Directory, in search of money to feed its armies and supply its arsenals. Switzerland was also regarded as a hotbed of conspiracies of royalists and English. The invasion of this country was, then, a double enterprise of revolutionary proselytism and of heavy taxation.[21]

This invasion had been prepared for in the course of many years by the sending of agents who propagated the new doctrine in Switzerland. A party was even formed, distinctly favorable to democratic institutions analogous to those of France. This party had at its head two men: Pfeffer of Lucern and Ochs of Basel; it formed plans of constitutions and stirred up insurrections here and there. We do not intend to relate the campaign which, under the direction of General Brune, resulted (April, 1798) in the proclamation of a new Swiss constitution. The Swiss confederation, made up of cantons mutually independent in domestic affairs, was followed by the Helvetic Republic, one and undivided. New cantonal boundaries were set up. The old Protestant canton of Berne was made into a fourth canton; on the other hand, the four small Catholic cantons of Schwyz, Uri, Zug, and Unterwalden formed only a single canton under the name of Waldestetten.

---

[21] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* V, 293.

The Catholic Cantons

Following these oppressive acts, you could see, on a more limited stage, but imposing by its memories, a sight most deserving of posterity, a strife forever memorable. Whereas the rich cantons under their aristocratic governments—Bern, Zurich, Basel, and Lucern—bowed their head beneath the yoke with humiliating weakness, the little Catholic cantons, which saw their truly democratic constitution taken from them, put up the most heroic resistance. When a proposal was made to these simple men that they send representatives to Aarau for the purpose of accepting the constitution, at first they believed that they would be allowed to make some remonstrances. The envoys whom they deputed to Bern, to the French commissioner, were ignominiously expelled. Soon afterward a proclamation by General Schassenburg, who was made military commander after the departure of Brune, declared that the priests of the five little cantons where the opposition seemed to be keener would be held responsible for whatever should disturb the public tranquillity. In fact, no one could fail to see that the movement was prompted chiefly by the religious attachments of this simple population. Did they not have to fear that, in depriving them of their hereditary liberties, the rulers would turn to take away their liberty of religion? This reasonable suspicion explains the part taken in this strife by the secular and regular clergy of the little cantons. What is certain is that these brave mountaineers, most of them unfamiliar with the use of arms, enlisted as one man and, thoughtless of the dangers, were ready to resist an experienced army four times the size of their little force.[22]

A young officer, thirty-three years old, Baron Aloys von Reding, one of whose ancestors was immortalized by a victory in 1315 over the Austrians, was asked to place himself at the head of the rebels. The new general marched on Lucern and (April, 1798) seized it almost without firing a shot. The first act of the victorious army was to go to the church, there to hear Mass and ask God's protection. In fact, the French army did come up, and the encounter gave promise of being terrible. It took place about the Morgarten, near the Lake of Zug, on May 2, a day ever since celebrated in the Swiss annals by the victory which they won there and which founded the independence of the nation. Such a memory electrified the Catholic army, which again and again repulsed the troops of Schassenburg. After two days of fighting, however, Aloys von Reding was obliged to ask for an armistice from the French general who, admiring so great courage, offered the Swiss army an honorable capitulation: provided the new constitution would be recognized, the Catholic religion would be maintained in the ancient part of Switzerland.[23]

---

[22] Picot, *Mémoires,* VIII, 156.

These conditions came near being rejected. The people hesitated to sacrifice their old liberties. But in a general assembly held in the town of Schwyz, where the entire people began by falling on their knees to implore the divine assistance, the priests begged their fellow citizens to accept the conditions offered them. Canon Schüller said to them: "You have sworn to die rather than accept the new constitution; but in uttering this oath you were convinced that this constitution threatened your faith and the freedom of your religion. Since, then, the capitulation gives assurance in these matters, your oath has ceased to exist."[24] Aloys von Reding seconded this view, which finally prevailed.

Unfortunately the article stipulating the freedom of the Catholic worship had not been set forth in writing in an official document. This regrettable omission occasioned a new uprising the next August with regard to the constitutional oath, which the Catholics were unwilling to take except with the most explicit reservations. Lower Unterwalden was the chief scene of the strife, which on both sides was fiercer than the preceding. The shepherds of Unterwalden had put on as cockades some images of the Blessed Virgin. Accompanied by their womenfolk, who dragged the cannons and passed the ammunition to the fighters, they defended themselves to desperation. Some monks exhorted them to fight well and to die well. More than one of them picked up a musket of a dead comrade to make use of it.

---

[23] F. de Crue in *Histoire générale,* VIII, 823. We know that this ancient part of Switzerland had as its center the three Catholic cantons of Schwyz (whence the word "Switzerland"), Uri, and Unterwalden.

[24] For this discourse in full, see Raoul-Rochette, *Histoire de la Révolution helvétique de 1797 à 1803.*

Schassenburg, in a letter published in the *Moniteur* of September 28, 1798, furnishes some details of these atrocious combats of the Unterwalden shepherds. He says: "We lost a large number, as was inevitable with the unbelievable obstinacy of those daring men, brave to the point of fury. They fought with clubs; they attacked with stones. . . . Several priests, and also a large number of women, remained on the spot." The victorious general could not resist showing his regrets to the victims of this heroic battle; he ordered that the children be gathered together and that a thousand rations of bread be distributed each day to the inhabitants who were left; the celebrated Lavater raised his voice in behalf of the oppressed, in a letter that he dated from "the first year of the Swiss servitude." Addressing the British Parliament, William Pitt paid a touching homage to them; and the economist and educator Pestalozzi was glad to receive in his schools a large number of the children who had been orphaned by this terrible war.

Ireland

Amid different circumstances but with equal warmth, the Catholics of Ireland also defended the freedom of their faith. Ever since Ireland, in its attachment to the Roman Church, had taken a stand against the tyrannical measures of Henry VIII, that fidelity to Catholicism had remained the characteristic trait of the Irish. The harsh regime under which Protestant England had long tried to subject Ireland is to be explained by this fact. Toward the end of the eighteenth century, however, a lull was produced. Several penal laws, but lately enacted against the Catholics, had been abrogated. Following the advice of their priests, the Irish Catholics consented to take the oath to the constitution: a law of 1793 granted them the right of voting, until then reserved to the Protestants. But the influence of the French Revolution had disturbed men's minds. The liberal party, enthusiastic for the new ideas, in the realm of its just complaints against the English tyranny had drawn to it a number of Catholics. Such was the origin of the association which later became famous as the Society of the United Irish. On the other hand, the rigid Protestants, vexed at seeing the Catholics enjoy rights that had formerly been reserved to themselves and alarmed at the projects of the new society, formed counterassociations. These, unswervingly loyal to William of Orange, took the name of "Orangemen," and their foes called themselves "Defenders." Both sides bound themselves by oaths and stirred up seditions. Blameworthy excesses were committed; blood flowed.

Priests and religious took an active part in these disturbances, allying themselves to men whose aim seemed to be the separation of Ireland and England and the establishment of a republic in the spirit of the French Revolution. One priest, Edward Murphy, even led men to battle. But the heads of the Irish Church took note of the danger. On May 22, 1798, the four Catholic archbishops, the twenty-two bishops, along with several lords and notables published a manifesto in which they proclaimed their attachment to the established order and forcefully protested against the direction given to the Society of United Irishmen.

Not all the Catholics followed these wise counsels; but the majority did so. Among the Catholics were some who freely entered the service of the government. In this number was Daniel O'Connell, who subsequently showed noble generosity in the defense of his religion and his country.

These events had two results. The English government, then in the hands of Pitt, crushed the Irish insurrection and profited by its victory to have the Parliament pass the Act of Union, which was approved by the King on July 2, 1800. In virtue of this Act, Ireland and England formed a single United Kingdom. The Irish Parliament was dissolved, and the deputies of Ireland who wished to sit in the Parliament of the united countries had to take an oath that was contrary to the Catholic faith. This requirement would, in fact, exclude them from the Parliament; such was the deplorable consequence of this Act. Moreover, of thirty-two Irish counties twenty-one protested energetically against the destruction of their parliament. Then Pitt resorted to a stratagem. To appease the resistance, he promised to emancipate the Catholics. Thus the agitation had this happy result.[25] William Pitt's request of King George for the emancipation of Irish Catholics was one of the reasons for his dismissal; all of O'Connell's efforts, crowned with success thirty years later, rested on this promise, explicitly and formally made in 1799 and stubbornly disregarded.

Napoleon

A glance at Italy, Spain, Germany, and even the Scandinavian countries would show there, more or less evidently, the awakening of Catholic vitality. All in all, the movement was undeniable. One man, whom we know well, had calculated its importance. This man was General Bonaparte. While the chief events we have just related were taking place, he was forming in Egypt the most grandiose plans, and expected to change the face of the earth.[26] Of a sudden news was received (October 9, 1799) that he had landed at Saint-Raphael near Fréjus on the coast of Provence.

---

[25] On this promise, see Thiers, *Histoire du consulat et de l'Empire,* II, 394.

He was expected, desired. The conqueror of the Pyramids, of Abukir, and of Mount Thabor had grown to the proportions of a hero in the popular imagination. In the *coup d'état* of 18 Brumaire (November 9, 1799), from which he emerged first consul, that is, practically the supreme head of France, Bonaparte was swept to power by the popular flood even more than by his own effort.[27] He at once appeared as being of the race destined to govern the world. His political genius was not less than his military genius. But in what direction was he going to exercise his power? By his connections with the Jacobins and by his philosophical ideas he belonged to the Revolution; by his political sense, perhaps also by a remnant of faith preserved in his Corsican soul, he was induced to take in hand the restoration of Catholicism. The Church might well fear everything from this man, and hope for everything.

His first statements were words of concord and peace. Said he: "No longer are we to have Jacobins or moderates or royalists, but everywhere Frenchmen." Some of his acts seemed to justify these words: the law of hostages was repealed, the graduated import duties were abolished. But the measures of religious pacification, which the Church hoped for, encountered obstacles in the first consul's entourage. The permission to return to France was at first granted only to such members of the clergy as had taken the constitutional oath or had given up their clerical status. The first consul even reproved the priests who in the pulpit too enthusiastically greeted the coming of the reparation regime.[28] His measures of clemency were prompted probably too much by political considerations. Little by little, however, the 3,000 priests that the revolutionary laws had forced to exile themselves were able to return to France and, provisionally put under the surveillance of police authorities, they were able to have their names removed from the list of *émigrés*. The bishops were not able to profit from this measure until two years later. In short, the new regime aroused some mistrust, but at the same time also some hopes.

---

[26] On these plans, see Albert Sorel, *op. cit.*, V, 430–45.

[27] See Vandal, *L'avènement de Bonaparte*, pp. 268–403; Albert Sorel, *op. cit.*, V, 475–89.

[28] Pisani, IV, 18.

The Conclave

The eyes of all Catholics turned anxiously toward Italy, where preparations were being made for the election of the next pope. In accord with a provision of Pius VI's will, the cardinals were allowed to meet in conclave wherever they should be found in the largest number. Emperor Francis II, through his minister Thugut, offered the cardinals the city of Venice for the purpose. Thirty-five cardinals[29] went there and (November 30, 1799) met in the Benedictine abbey of St. George. Consalvi, the future cardinal, was appointed secretary of the august gathering. In his *Mémoires* he has left us a vivid account of this conclave.[30]

Emperor Francis II of Austria, in taking under his protection the assembly that was going to give a pope to the Church, may have wished to make reparation for the troubles his father Leopold II and his uncle Joseph II had caused the papacy. Did he dream of taking over in the Church the old traditions of the Holy Empire? Soon his aim became evident: especially to have a candidate of his choice elected, or at least to prevent at any price the choice of a rival who might put an obstacle in the way of his policy.

---

[29] The total number of cardinals was forty-six. Of these, eleven, scattered in different parts of Europe, were unable to come to Venice.

[30] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* I, 199–291. The details given by Consalvi are confirmed and supplemented by the scholarly work of Father Van Duerm, *Un peu plus de lumière sur le conclave de Venise,* 1896. Cf. the bitter and exaggerated account by Maury, *Mémoires,* I, 183–375.

From the outset the preference of most of the cardinals centered on Cardinal Bellisomi, bishop of Cesena. But Cardinal Herzan, the representative of Austria, was instructed to maintain energetically the candidacy of Cardinal Mattei, archbishop of Ferrara. As legate of the Holy See, Mattei had signed the Treaty of Tolentino, which granted Austria the possession of the three legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna. Hardly would anyone suppose that, once elected pope, he would think of destroying what he had agreed to as Cardinal. Besides, Vienna knew the gentle, affable, and conciliatory character of Cardinal Mattei and hoped to exercise a political influence over him.[31] For almost two months Cardinal Bellisomi day after day had twenty-two votes, and Cardinal Mattei continued to have the thirteen votes of his followers without any of them seeming disposed to shift his vote to the majority.

Then Consalvi began to show that political character, a mixture of sound logic, coaxing shrewdness, and outspoken flattery, which won for him the esteem and confidence of diplomats of the time.[32] He let the factions wear themselves out. A few bolder spirits, impatient to conclude the affair, proposed the candidacy of the learned Cardinal Gerdil, held in high regard for his works of philosophy and scholarship no less than for his virtues. But Gerdil was born in Savoy, and Savoy had just been annexed to France. Austria took alarm. At once Cardinal Herzan uttered the exclusive[33] against Gerdil. The court of Vienna was thus using up its power, for the exclusive could be given only once. Herzan, on the other hand, had the imprudence to ask his colleagues for a delay of eleven or twelve days, saying that such delay was needed for sending a messenger to his sovereign and receiving a reply.

---

[31] An incident, known to the court of Vienna, showed the character of Cardinal Mattei. When Bonaparte, upon entering Ferrara in 1796, learned that the archbishop of that city had introduced the papal troops, he was enraged, ordered Mattei to his headquarters at Brescia, and declared: "Do you know, Archbishop, that I could have you shot?" "You are the master," answered the Cardinal. "All I ask is a quarter hour to prepare myself." To this Napoleon replied: "Such is not the question. How quick you are!" Mattei's words gave rise to the saying, that the Archbishop of Ferrara was better able to die well than to govern well.

[32] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Pie VII,* I, 84.

[33] On the origin and nature of the exclusive, see Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* VI, 443.

The move seemed offensive enough in the actual circumstances. Consalvi in his *Mémoires* says that it furnished grounds for a fear that a pretext would be established to revive the old abuse of petitioning the permission of Caesar before installing a new pope. This was the moment chosen by the clever secretary of the conclave to act with promptness and decision, guided solely by solicitude for the interests of the Church and the papacy. He turned to Cardinal Maury, whose word exercised a real influence over the Sacred College. Consalvi and Maury, appealing to the spirit of independence which must be safeguarded against outside interference, soon detached from the two parties a number of cardinals, jealous to affirm the freedom of their vote.

Election of Pius VII

Thus was again formed the "flying squadron," which in former elections exercised a preponderant and decisive part. The flying squadron was soon master of the ground and, under Consalvi's inspiration, chose for candidate the bishop of Imola, Cardinal Barnabas Chiaramonti. Until then his name was not even mentioned in the conclave. Chiaramonti had been the most beloved helper of the late pope; he was but fifty-eight years old, as was his predecessor at the time of his election, and tradition was against the raising of such a young man to the supreme pontificate. As Consalvi said, these conditions at first seemed to constitute "extrinsic obstacles" in the way of electing the Bishop of Imola. However, everyone appreciated his personal qualities. The cardinals at the funeral of Pius VI said to one another, when they mentioned Chiaramonti: "What a pity that this conclave is the one that must choose a successor of Pius VI! If we but had a pope between the two, in three days we would name the new one, and this is the one."

A great gentleness of character, an unsurpassed purity of morals, a constant prudence in conducting his two dioceses of Tivoli and Imola, successively entrusted to his care, recommended the person of the holy prelate to universal esteem. The whole tactics of Consalvi and Maury consisted in demolishing what the far-sighted secretary called "the extrinsic obstacles." Their combined efforts succeeded. On March 14, 1800, Barnabas Chiaramonti was elected pope and, in memory of his venerated predecessor, took the name of Pius VII.

Life of Pius VII

The new pontiff, born at Cesena in the legation of Forli on August 14, 1742, came of an illustrious family and received an education worthy of his rank. His father, Count Scipio Chiaramonti, was a man of intellectual worth. "His mother, daughter of Marchese Ghini, was indeed a lady of singular excellence, renowned in the world for every religious quality. After having completed the education of her children, when the future pontiff had reached the age of twenty-one, in 1763, she entered a convent of Carmelites at Fano, where her memory is still cherished, and where she died in 1771, at the age of sixty." [34] From his early years he who would exercise over the episcopate the greatest act of authority recorded in the history of the papacy, he who would defend the Church against the enterprises of the mightiest of potentates, showed a gentle, amiable, and peace-loving character, These traits led to his being spoken of in the biblical words describing Moses: "He was a man exceeding meek above all men that dwelt upon earth" (Num. 12:3).

---

[34] Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes,* p. 23. Wiseman also relates that at Rome people used to say that the persistent opposition of the son, when he was raised to the supreme pontificate, was the only thing that prevented a solemn recognition, by beatification, of the extraordinary holiness of his mother.

At the age of sixteen, upon finishing his education in the college of nobles, he made a decision that surprised no one who knew him intimately: he became a novice in the Benedictine abbey of Santa Maria del Monte, near Cesena, his native city. Twenty-four years of monastic life fully trained in detachment from the world the future prisoner of Savona and Fontainebleau. There also he developed that strength, often a trait of amiable characters, which can endure without complaint and act without discouragement. Well versed in sacred and profane sciences, he was successively professor in the colleges which his order had at Parma and Rome, then in the monastery of St. Callistus, where he taught canon law. In 1782 Pius VI entrusted to him the government of the diocese of Tivoli, and three years later with that of the diocese of Imola; that same year the Pope created him cardinal. In these two posts Chiaramonti had occasion to show that gentleness and application to study were not his only virtues. Pacca wrote: "Having attentively studied his character, and well knowing his disposition, I can affirm that Pius VII was a man by no means deficient in talent, nor of a weak, pusilanimous nature; he was conspicuous for his firm resolution and the liveliness of his mind. He possessed that description of good sense that in matters of business intuitively perceives the difficulties to be overcome and sees everything in its proper light." [35]

When the legations were invaded by the French armies (February, 1797), the cardinal-bishop of Imola was not willing to present himself before the conquering general, but he did not withdraw from his diocese, as did the bishop of Ancona, Cardinal Banuzzi. This conduct was noted by Bonaparte, who was displeased with the flight of the Bishop of Ancona. To the people of the country who brought him the keys of Ancona, he said: "The Bishop of Imola, who is also a cardinal, did not flee. As I passed there, I did not see him, but he is at his post." [36]

---

[35] Cf. Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

The Bishop of Imola promptly showed that his attitude did not imply any systematic opposition to the new political forms that were being implanted in Italy, but simply reprobated any attack on the Church and against right. In a Christmas sermon (December 25, 1797), soon made public with his name, he said: "The democratic form of government is not at all repugnant to the Gospel. On the contrary, it requires all the lofty virtues that are learned only at the school of Jesus Christ. May virtue, vivified by the natural lights and strengthened by the teaching of the Gospel, be the solid foundation of our democracy." He concluded by saying: "Be Christians, and you will be excellent democrats." [37]

Pius VII and Bonaparte

This sermon would be severely criticized in Italy and France. It was received with restrictions by more than one historian. At least the pope who had thus spoken would not refuse to accept a government, whatever it might be, that would consent to treat with him on the basis of respect for the rights of the Church. The first consul, for his part, felt disposed to enter into negotiations with him whose intrepid courage and peaceful spirit he had experienced. Pius VII and Bonaparte were ready to negotiate together, between the French government and the Church, the concordat which all France was waiting for and the whole Christian world would welcome in its good results.

---

[36] Count d'Haussonville, *L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire,* I, 27.

[37] For the text of this sermon, see *ibid.,* I, 355–71. Cf. Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, chap. 4, and Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* Bk. 90.

CHAPTER VIII

The French Concordat of 1801

First Acts of Pius VII

Many of the great popes, in their first encyclical, have outlined the program of their pontificate. In 1775, Pius VI, who was destined for a quarter of a century to defend the Catholic Church ceaselessly against the various attacks of the revolutionary spirit, had, with wonderful clearness, announced the two major dangers of his time: "the corruption of morals, language, and life," which was preparing the fall of the old regime, and the venturesome rashness of the philosophers who, "proclaiming that man is born free and has no need of submitting to anyone," prefaced all the utopias of the Revolution. In 1800, Pius VII, whose task during the course of twenty-five years would be to labor with rare loftiness of mind in concert with the rulers, at a work of religious restoration, declared the basic conditions of that restoration. He said:

> The decrees of kings and the military forces of the generals have been able to re-establish order, so deeply disturbed; but if the poison of bad doctrines is not removed and if it is allowed to develop, I declare to you with alarm, venerable brethren, that this poison will spread over the whole world and then neither armies nor militias nor fortifications nor munitions of war nor the armaments of mighty empires will be able to safeguard us from it. The Church with her holy laws, the virtues and piety that emanate from her, is the true remedy for the terrible poison. . . . Princes and heads of states should, then, understand that nothing can in a greater degree contribute to the welfare and glory of the nations than to let the Church live according to her own laws in the freedom of her divine constitution. Let them recall

the words of our wise predecessor, St. Zeno: "A ruler can do nothing more profitable for his own interests than to bow before the authority instituted by God, whenever the cause of God is involved."[1]

At the very time when the Sovereign Pontiff was speaking thus, the attitude of the princes and the various peoples toward him was of a sort to offer him serious hopes. The Emperor of Austria, disappointed in his designs, at first showed his dissatisfaction by refusing to allow the new pontiff to be crowned in the church of St. Mark;[2] but finally he accepted the accomplished fact with good grace and sent envoys to greet the Pope. Pius VII likewise received the homage of the representatives of Sardinia, Naples, and Spain. The emperor of Russia, Paul I, delegated a special envoy to the Pope. The Holy Father at his entry into Rome (July 3, 1800), was hailed with demonstrations of universal joy.

The first acts of his government increased his prestige. The appointment of Cardinal Consalvi to the post of Secretary of State was a guaranty of a prudently progressive administration. The finances were reorganized; the shipment of grain was freed from taxation; many abuses were abolished. To wipe out the debt of 5,000,000 francs which weighed on the state following the sad events of the recent years, the new Pope gave the example of a strict economy in the management of his household. His aim was to take up again, as soon as possible, the tremendous projects of Pius VI for the relief of commerce and industry. The Roman states (unfortunately minus Beneventum and Pontecorvo, which remained in the hands of the king of Naples and the three legations which Austria still held) witnessed a rebirth of peace and relative tranquillity. But Napoleon's intervention presently upset the order of things in Italy.

At the very time when Pius VII's first encyclical appeared

---

[1] Encyclical of May 15, 1800, in Barberi, *Bullarium*, XI, 24.

[2] Van Duerm, *Un peu plus de lumiere sur le conclave de Venise*, p. 264.

(May, 1800), the first consul, amid difficulties of all sorts, was accomplishing that famous passage of the Alps which deserves to be counted as one of his most memorable undertakings. About four weeks later, after a series of battles, the daring general routed the army of Mélas at Marengo. In less than a month Austria lost all she had taken a year to conquer, and her army withdrew behind the line of the Mincio.

But Bonaparte amid his triumphs declared that, conformably to the unanimous wish of the peoples, he himself aspired only to establish a solid peace in the world. On the morrow of his election to the office of first consul, he wrote to the King of England: "Sire, will the war, which for ten years has ravaged the four quarters of the world, be everlasting? Surely we must feel that peace is the first of needs as it is the first of glories." A letter conveying the same sentiments was sent to the Emperor of Austria. Diplomatic negotiations had succeeded in separating from the European coalition the Emperor of Russia and the King of Spain; an army of 25,000 men held Portugal in submission, and the operations of Kleber in Egypt and of Moreau in Bavaria had, according to the assurances of the first consul, no other purpose but to impose, by terror, peace upon the belligerents.

That peace, which he desired to give Europe, Bonaparte wished also to establish about him. The cessation of wars was not enough for him; he dreamed of a final pacification of minds. To rally the republicans to him he relied on the presence of Carnot and Fouché in his ministry; on the presence of Talleyrand he counted to win royalists. Said he to his brother Joseph: "What revolutionary will fail to have confidence in an order of things where Fouché will be minister? What nobleman will not hope to find a means of livelihood under the former bishop of Autun? The one guards my left, the other my right."

But this arrangement did not yet solve the problem. Neither the pacification of the nations nor that of the parties could give the results which the first consul expected in the religious pacification. Bonaparte's deep political understanding had glimpsed this truth in 1797; he was still more impressed with it in 1800. He was convinced that nothing would be accomplished so long as the government of the French Republic had not concluded an agreement with the head of the Catholic Church.

But, after certain words and certain deeds which the Catholics could not erase from their memories, he needed to give them some pledges. On June 5, when about to leave Milan to give combat to Mélas, General Bonaparte assembled the clergy of the city and addressed these maturely weighed words to them.

> I have desired to see you all gathered here that I might have the satisfaction of making known to you the sentiments that animate me with regard to the Catholic, apostolic, and Roman Church. . . . Being now in the enjoyment of full power, I have decided to put in motion all the means that I judge most suitable to assure and guarantee that religion. The modern philosophers have striven to persuade France that the Catholic religion was the implacable foe of every democratic system and of all republican government. . . . I, too, am a philosopher, and I know that in any society no man can pass for virtuous and just if he does not know whence he comes and whither he is bound. Mere reason cannot give us certainty about that. Without religion we are always walking in darkness; and the Catholic religion alone gives man certain and infallible lights on his origin and his last end. A society without religion is like a ship without a compass. . . . Let not the way the late Pope was treated inspire you with any fear. . . . When I shall be able to confer with the new Pope, I hope to have the happiness of removing all the obstacles that might still rise up to hinder the full reconciliation of France with the head of the Church.[3]

This address was printed[4] and spread in large quantity; the reverberations of it were immense and such as Napoleon had desired for it. The victory of Marengo did not divert him from his project. On the contrary, by augmenting his prestige that brilliant success enabled him to be more daring. On June 18 he decided to assist at the solemn *Te Deum* in the Milan cathedral, and to the two other consuls he sent the following proud dispatch: "Today, in spite of what the Paris atheists may say of it, I am going in full pomp to assist at the *Te Deum* which will be sung in the metropolitan church of Milan."

---

[3] *Correspondance de Napoléon Ier*, VI, 339–41.

[4] Notably in the *Annales philosophiques, morales et littéraires* (1800), II, 246, and in the *Etrennes religieuses* published by Father Courbon.

In most minds such steps effaced the sad impression left by Napoleon at the time of his first Italian campaign. The way was now prepared for a negotiation. The first consul took a further step. Among the priests gathered about him at Milan, he noticed a venerable old man, a pious and simple soul, Cardinal Martiniana, bishop of Verceil. On this man he turned his eyes to open the preliminaries with the Sovereign Pontiff. On his way to Paris, he stopped for a few hours at Verceil and took the aged bishop aside,[5] saying to him:

> I wish religion in France. The intruders of the first and the second order are a mass of disgraceful bandits, whom I wish to shake loose from me. Some of the old bishops receive no consideration in their dioceses, where they almost never reside; several have emigrated merely to conspire. The question of their resignation will be taken up with them. Moreover, the dioceses are too numerous. I wish to make a clean slate of the Gallican Church.[6] I desire a new clergy. If the Pope will be reasonable, if he grasps the present situation, we will be able, the two of us together, to reconcile France with the Church. Go to Rome and tell the Holy Father that the first consul wishes to make him a present of 30,000,000 French Catholics.[7]

---

[5] Letter of Cardinal Martiniana to Pius VII, quoted by Cardinal Mathieu (*Le concordat de 1801*, p. 3). The letter was published for the first time in full by Father Rinieri, S.J., in his *La diplomatie pontificale au XIXe siècle, le concordat entre Pie VII et le premier consul* (Verdier translation, pp. 16–18).

[6] *Vuol far caso vergine della chiesa gallicana*, wrote Martiniana. Mathieu, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[7] On this conversation of General Bonaparte with Cardinal Martiniana, see the Cardinal's letter to Pius VII in Mathieu, *Le concordat de 1801*, pp. 3–5, and Maury, *Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires*, I, 461.

The good, trustful soul of the pious cardinal saw in these words nothing more than the announcement of a new era of peace and holy prosperity for the Church. Incapable of perceiving in the General's authoritarian and dictatorial tone the threatening forecast of the future strifes,[8] he wrote to the Pope that, "once the idea of the first consul is accepted, everything will be easily arranged," and he begged His Holiness to authorize him to continue his dealings with "the illustrious and most distinguished principal."[9]

Roman Distrust

The proposals of "the illustrious and most distinguished principal," even when read with the benevolent interpretation of the Bishop of Verceil, inspired at the Roman court merely an admiration mingled with much reserve. Was not this Bonaparte the one who imposed the Treaty of Tolentino, so disastrous for the Holy See? Today he calls himself a good Catholic; but are we not told that only recently in Egypt he declared himself a Moslem?

This distrust was but too well justified. Of course we cannot easily weigh, in the souls of men, the allowance for generous ideas and for personal calculation. "Such a judgment belongs to a tribunal more infallible than that of history."[10] But what we know about Pius VII and about Bonaparte enable us, even at this juncture, to formulate a hypothesis that will receive a striking confirmation in the subsequent story of this period. Under similar formulas of pacification and conciliation we can readily see profound differences in the tendencies of the Pope and of the first consul. When even at Imola the future

---

[8] "His intentions are as pure as his mind is circumscribed," commented Ghislieri, the representative of Austria at Rome. Maury, speaking more crudely, says of him: "He has no head." Mathieu, p. 10.

[9] Mathieu, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[10] D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, I, 67.

Pius VII loyally accepted the democratic government of the legations, he was guided entirely by the thought of the salvation of souls.[11] When, with a sincerity that we have no right to question, General Bonaparte proclaimed the benefits of the Catholic religion, his correspondence and his confidences prove that he was already thinking of the empire and the coronation. Says the Count d'Haussonville: "Read through the pages of his correspondence. You will there discover on every page a ceaseless preoccupation: somewhere to strike a blow not less resounding than the one he has just delivered; the trophies of Marengo have, in his eyes, their whole value only if they mark the route that would lead to the empire." [12] Already anyone could foresee that every time some opposition arose, in the sequence of events, between the rights of absolute justice and Bonaparte's ambition, serious conflicts would have to be feared between the head of the Church and the first magistrate of the French government.

This fundamental divergence would be the chief source of the difficulties that arose in the sequel between Pius VII and Bonaparte. Other difficulties sprang up in their train.

The most intransigeant of the *émigrés* had their center in Rome. At the conclave they even tried to have their own candidate. On August 12, 1798, the Count of Provence, who, after the death of the dauphin, took the title of Louis XVIII, wrote to Cardinal Maury: "I should like the future head of the Church to be a man of mature age, whose hard trials have given splendor to his courage, whose eloquence should be known to all Europe. All that is lacking to this portrait is your name. You, therefore, are the one I desire to see raised to the papal throne."[13] Such a candidacy had no chance of succeeding, and the idea was given up. But the ambitious Maury, officially representing King Louis XVIII at the papal court, kept the prince acquainted with all the political and religious affairs. This unreliable man, who ten years later would grievously afflict the Pope by his exaggerated imperialism, moved heaven and earth to thwart, between Pius VII and the first consul, any accord that would consolidate the new regime to the detriment of the rights of the traditional royalty. Bishop Nicolai of Bézier had exactly the same view of the situation. "My system," he said, "is that without legitimate royalty, no Catholicity in France; likewise, without Catholicity, no royalty."[14]

---

[11] Recalling an earlier incident in the life of Pius VII, Cardinal Wiseman, speaking of him, notes: "The same courage in meeting an enemy face to face, and the same bold adhesion to duty, will be found blended with the same condescension and readiness to avoid useless resistance and fruitless collision" (*Recollections of the Last Four Popes,* p. 101).

[12] *D'Haussonville, op. cit.,* I, 66.

In Bonaparte's entourage, from an entirely different point of view, the opposition was not less keen with regard to any understanding with Rome. The *Decade philosophique,* the organ of the members of the Institute, published bitter articles against the Pope and the clergy. The *Ami des lois* wrote: "You will see that the priests are going to resume their grasping and ambitious views. . . . Some have carried their impudence to the point of hoping that they will induce the consuls to go to Mass."[15] By Fouché the antireligious spirit entered the ranks of the police, who multiplied the investigations of the "refractory" priests and pointed to their so-called intrigues. In the words of one report: "Priests are actively going about to re-establish the fanaticism." In another police report we read: "Emboldened by indulgence, they redouble their efforts to destroy the most sacred institutions." [16] "The old religion," wrote Fouché himself in a circular to the prefects, "is taking up again the sway it had before the Revolution. The government places no obstacle in their way, but their intolerance is added to their domination and to their desire to destroy all the republican institutions." [17] Other reproaches seemed to reflect on the first consul himself, for the words allegedly being spoken by the priests, the minister of police regarded as injurious to the government; but they were the very words pronounced by the first consul at Milan. Said Fouché: "The priests are spreading the word that the government feels the need of a religion, that no civilized state exists which has not its religion, that in France we cannot have any other religion but the Catholic religion, and that the government is convinced of this truth, being persuaded that order and internal peace will be re-established only by the aid of religion." [18]

---

[13] Maury, *op. cit.,* I, 188.

[14] Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du Concordat,* I, 75. This quarrel over the projects of a concordat was an appendage to a more general quarrel, stirred up in regard to the promise of "fidelity to the Constitution," which a decree of December 28, 1799, required of the priests. Maury, with the unreflecting enthusiasm of his eager imagination, hurled himself into the strife, giving forth with assurance that such an oath, opposed to the inalienable rights of the king of France, was reproved in a high place, presenting himself as interpreter of the cardinalitial congregations, taking to task Archbishop de Juigné of Paris for his lack of energy, accusing that prelate with being "intoxicated with Presbyterianism and democracy." Maury, *op. cit.,* II, 94. Father Emery wrote: "To think like that is to imagine that we can restore the old government; this is to deceive ourselves and sacrifice religion to illusions." Letter of January 31, 1800, to Father de Romeuf. Cf. L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* I, 280–87.

[15] *Amis des lois,* January 3, 1800.

But neither Pius VII nor Bonaparte was ready to retreat before such opposition. Bonaparte had trust in his own strength and, as he said, in "his star." Pius VII, "as soon as he was elected, offered himself to God as an expiatory victim to obtain the end of the revolutionary strife and the return of France to the practice of religion." [19] In all these threats the Pope saw simply the occasion to realize his generous offering.

---

[16] According to the national archives; quoted by Pisani, *L'église de Paris pendant la Révolution,* IV, 26.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 42.

[18] Circular of 20 Thermidor, national archives, A F IV, 1329. Quoted by Pisani, IV, 44. See *ibid.,* pp. 45–47, for the various police measures taken with regard to a teaching prospectus of the College of Navarre, in which we read a denunciation of "the antirevolutionary intrigues" of some "retrograde teachers." This prospectus is quoted by Aulard, *Paris sous le Concordat,* I, 506.

[19] Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 9.

By a letter dated September 13, 1800, the Pope informed the French bishops about the opening of the preliminary negotiations with the first consul. Supposing that the negotiations would take place in Italy, he had sent to Verceil, to be at Martiniana's side, Spina, the archbishop of Corinth, a devout and enlightened prelate, personally known to General Bonaparte and highly esteemed by him.[20]

Louis XVIII

On both sides the expected opposition broke loose. On September 8, at the first rumors of a possible conference between the Pope and the first consul, Louis XVIII wrote to the Emperor of Russia, Paul I, the following letter:

> Dear brother and cousin, never perhaps has the cause of the French monarchy run a greater danger than at this moment; never also have I turned to Your Imperial Majesty with more confidence. To spare your time, I shall not enlarge on the proceedings of Bonaparte regarding the Pope, on the consequences it may have, and on the remedies I have tried to apply. But, imploring your support, I beg you to give the Holy Father, by your powerful intervention, the strength to resist the insidious proposals of the hypocritical usurper. I am certain of the effect that a step by Your Imperial Majesty would produce on the mind of the Pope, and I hope that Your Imperial Majesty is assured of the deep gratitude which you will arouse or rather will redouble in me.[21]

Paul I did not lend himself to a proceeding that he judged vain. Toward the end of September, Cardinal Maury, by the hand of his brother and vicar general, Father Maury, presented to the Pope a note in which were found ably set forth all the difficulties and objections that the enemies of any accord were opposing to the initiative of the first consul and to the favorable consideration by the Pope.[22] A month later (October 30, 1800) Louis XVIII addressed the following letter to Bishop de la Fare of Nancy, who was his representative at Vienna: "Bonaparte's proposals seem not such as can be accepted by the Holy Father; but if His Holiness has that weakness, the King counts on the firmness of the majority of the bishops of his realm not to submit to laws that the Pope himself, and *a fortiori* an illegitimate government, has not the right to impose on it." [23]

---

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[21] Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801*, p. 17.

The schism of the Little Church can be seen in germ in these last lines; but they are to be explained from a purely political point of view. Bonaparte, by contributing to the re-establishment of worship, would by a single stroke win the gratitude of the mass of Catholics and would thus deprive the royalist party of its best supports.

This opposition of the royalists was sure to prompt the first consul to hasten the conclusion of an accord with the Pope. But Bonaparte would encounter from the Pope difficulties no less grave. None of the learned men and lawyers that Bonaparte liked to have about him, and none of his companions in arms, approved of the idea of restoring Catholicism. To surmount these obstacles the first consul was obliged to call upon all the prodigious resources of his facile mind. His tactics varied according to the nature of the resistances. At times his method was brutal. One annalist well situated to know the small incidents of that policy, tells us: "Bonaparte discussed the matter with Volney, having told him that he intended to re-establish the worship and to pay salaries to the clergy. Thereupon Volney was outspoken in criticism of this plan and alleged that enough would be done if they re-established freedom of worship and left to each one the care and burden of maintaining it and of paying the ministers of whatever religion he professed." "But," said Bonaparte, "France asks me to be responsible for both." To this remark, Volney replied, perhaps with that arrogance which was usual to him: "Very well, if France asked you for the Bourbons, would you give these to France?" At these words, Bonaparte, not restraining his temper any longer and giving free rein to one of those outbursts not rare with him, knocked Volney down with a kick in the stomach; then, ringing for an attendant, he cooly ordered that Volney be taken to his carriage.[24]

---

[22] This long *Note sur les conférences de Verceil* was published for the first time in full by Ricard, *Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires inédits du Cardinal Maury,* I, 461–79.

[23] Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du Concordat,* I, 105.

The most terrible opponents were not those of Volney's stripe. Other counsellors of the first consul, that they might block the negotiations, proceeded to organize a clever and cunning work; a system of deceits and intrigues hard to thwart. In the very first rank of these evil counsellors was the former bishop of Autun, who was at this time called citizen Talleyrand. After he had inaugurated the constitutional schism, "he discarded the new Church as readily as he had the old,"[25] and, having returned to the lay state, he was united in matrimony to a divorced, Protestant English woman, Mrs. Gand.[26] On July 15, 1797, he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs. Reappointed to these same functions after a short interruption, he was officially commissioned in 1800 to treat with Rome. Talleyrand was careful to avoid clashing head-on with the first consul; and at bottom, the re-establishment of the old religion was in accord with his own mind inasmuch as he hoped to obtain an honorable place in the new organization; but as soon as he saw that such a place would be refused him, he strove continually, if not to oppose the enterprise openly, "at least to lack zeal for it, to stir up incidents, and to slow the proceedings by placing obstacles in the way of the relations of the Roman court with his principals."[27] Then, when he judged that the moment had come, he gently insinuated to Napoleon that the latter's first move had perhaps not been good; before the mind of the man whose dominant instincts he knew, he evoked the pope of Canossa and the adversary of Philip the Fair. From then on, he never neglected an occasion to hinder the negotiations, to increase the obstacles, to arouse misunderstandings, and to spread snares of all sorts. Said Caselli, one of Pius VII's representatives: "We have many enemies, of whom the most implacable and most powerful is the Bishop of Autun."[28] As Cobentzel wrote to the Emperor of Austria, "in general Talleyrand has always shown the greatest ill will for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in France."[29]

---

[24] Besnard, *Souvenirs d'un nonagénaire,* II, 197. Besnard, a defrocked priest, was a special friend of Volney. The recollections concerning the old regime and the Revolution, says Cardinal Mathieu, "are one of the most interesting books that have been written about this period." Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 84.

[25] Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 35.

[26] Mrs. Gand, English by her husband's nationality, was French by birth. See *Correspondant,* CCXX, 659.

Back of Talleyrand, another priest of quite different manner, Grégoire, that unreformed revolutionary who recited his Breviary and defied the atheists, that obstinate champion of a Christianity more moral than that of Talleyrand, but perhaps more hostile to the authority of Rome, put to work all his dealings to influence the first consul in the direction of abandoning any project of agreement with the Pope, and utilized all the resources of his theological and canonical knowledge to point out the dangers of a re-establishment of Roman Catholicism in France.[30]

---

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[28] Letter of June 1, 1801, published *ibid.*, p. 37.

[29] Dispatch of June 10, 1801 (*ibid.*, p. 36). The facts mentioned above, many of which will be explicitly recalled in subsequent pages of this volume, did not prevent Talleyrand from writing in his *Mémoires*, when speaking of the Concordat: "This great reconciliation with the Church, to which I powerfully contributed . . ." (Talleyrand, *Mémoires*, I, 284). If we were to take the history of the negotiations in its aggregate, we could not affirm more clearly the contrary of the truth. Yet we would not be exact in declaring, as certain historians have done, that Talleyrand employed a systematic one-sided attitude to hinder the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. While he was able to hope for a preponderant part, he desired it. Bernard de Lacombe has proved this view by decisive documents, emanating from the most irrefutable participants or witnesses. Cf. B. de Lacombe, "Le mariage de Talleyrand," in the *Correspondant*, August 25 and September 10, 1905 (CCXX, 658, 853).

Bonaparte did not see his way to rid himself of these diverse influences, some of which corresponded with his own inmost sentiments. Evidences of this fact we shall see presently. But the re-establishment of Catholic worship in France was too closely bound up with the general plan of his policy and with the goal of his ambition for him to entertain the thought of abandoning the undertaking. He advanced firmly along the path he had marked out for himself.

Papal Envoys to Paris

On September 4, 1800, Bonaparte had his minister of foreign affairs, Talleyrand, write the following letter, addressed to Cardinal Martiniana. "The first consul . . . has the greatest satisfaction in seeing that the Holy Father's sentiments of concord agree with his own. He thinks he should await the arrival of Monsignor Spina at Verceil before giving me the order to reply in his name. He directs me to send you the passports necessary for this prelate's coming to Paris."

These last words utterly disconcerted the papal legates and the Holy Father himself, who were counting on having the negotiations carried on in Italy. But Bonaparte, who probably feared to have the eyes of Europe as well as those of his entourage perceive his initiative in this affair, had perhaps also hoped to exercise at Paris a more direct influence on the Italian diplomats. By one of those sudden decisions not unusual with him, he himself, without any prearrangement with the Pope, decided this serious question of the place for the negotiations. The Pope considered that he ought not raise a protest against this demand, which, moreover, accidentally procured an advantage for him. Monsignor Spina perceived that the good Cardinal Martiniana, in his desire to please the first consul, had already made excessive concessions to him, and from these Bonaparte subsequently never ceased to take advantage.[31] The transfer of the negotiations to Paris enabled Pius VII more easily to withdraw the excessively frank diplomat from the affair, in spite of his most urgent offers of service.

---

[30] See Mathieu, p. 44, the summary of the memorial addressed by Grégoire to the first consul in August, 1800.

The Holy Father sent with Monsignor Spina a Servite priest, Father Caselli, well known for his theological skill. The two papal envoys reached Paris on November 5, 1800,[32] and took up a modest lodging in a small furnished house, the Hôtel de Rome, on rue Saint-Dominique.

The Pope and his legates were quite aware of the difficulties of the situation. To carry on the negotiations at Paris was not only to assume the attitude of a somewhat humiliating initiative, but it was also to give the appearance of accepting the French government at the very moment when certain venerable men, such as Father Emery and Father de Boulogne, by the simple fact of their promise of fidelity to the Constitution, were the objects of the bitterest recriminations on the part of some ardent Catholics. The situation might seem to imply that the papal envoys were discussing, on a footing of equality, almost of inferiority, with the apostate or rebellious clerics who were in Bonaparte's entourage: Talleyrand, Sieyès, Fouché,[33] perhaps Grégoire, the most fanatical if not the most irreligious of all, who was charged with having presented the project of the meeting. Apparently Grégoire had an effective hand in preparing a project; but the first consul no doubt feared that the thought of treating with the head of the schismatics would make the Holy Father hold back; Bonaparte therefore declined the offers of the Bishop of Loir-et-Cher.

---

[31] Later on, to the objections of the Roman diplomats, Bonaparte replied: "You are going back on your word: Martiniana told me that was agreed to." Cardinal Consalvi wrote on January 11, 1801: "No one would believe the prejudice which Cardinal Martiniana has caused for the negotiation in the little he had to do with it."

[32] *Annales catholiques,* VI, 384.

[33] Fouché was not in holy orders, but had put on the cassock and filled the functions of professor in several colleges of the Oratory, including that of Juilly.

To obviate these grave disadvantages as far as possible, Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State, enjoined on Spina to avoid with utmost care whatever might give a diplomatic character to his mission. He was to consider himself and present himself merely as an envoy commissioned to hear the proposals that would be made and transmit them to the Pope, without being authorized to solve anything whatever.[34] At the outset of the negotiations the first demand to be made by Spina will be for the abolition of the promise of fidelity to the government. In other words, the able Secretary of State, the better to protect himself from the eventual complaints of the party that had Maury for its violent interpreter, insisted on noting the difference between an act of submission to persons not implying adherence to any principle, and the acceptance of laws which might amount to an acceptance of the principles.[35]

Spina and his companion were scrupulously exact in following this line of conduct. Retiring to their modest apartment, they closed the door to all, even to Father Emery, who tried in vain to reach them.[36] They saw only one diplomat, Musquiz, the Spanish ambassador, who was the only one representing at Paris any great Catholic power that was at peace with France. With regard to the men and affairs of Paris and of the consulship, Musquiz gave them indications of their complete lack of such information as would enable them to avoid proceeding as blind men and to avoid irritating or producing friction with those they needed to convince and win.

---

[34] Instructions of October 13, 1800, published by Boulay de la Meurthe, III, 597–637.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery*, II, 41.

Spina and Bernier

The superior of St. Sulpice echoed the feelings of part of the Paris clergy, discreetly grieving at so mysterious a procedure. He said: "I fear the arrangements without anyone being consulted." [37] The future would show that the tactics ordered by Consalvi were the safest.[38]

On November 8, 1800, the Archbishop of Corinth saw enter his room at the Hôtel de Rome a little, thickset, squint-eyed man with features far from handsome, whose intelligent and sharp eyes, however, and clear speech, logical and earnest, had a winning quality. He presented himself in the name of the first consul, who had commissioned him to confer with the papal envoy on the pending questions.

The man thus chosen by Bonaparte was a priest [39] of blameless doctrine but one whose political life, until then greatly agitated, gave rise to quite divergent judgments of him. This man was Father Bernier, formerly pastor of Angers. Over the revolting peasants of the Vendée he exercised an almost incredible influence. He had actually taken part in the combats and entered into the councils of the Vendean leaders, at first dominating them; after strifes and intrigues in which his part had appeared suspect, he became embroiled with the principal generals of the Catholic army. At the close of 1799, after 18 Brumaire, at the very time when everyone was desiring peace, he had gone to General d'Hédouville of the republican army and abruptly said to him: "Let our peasants have their pastors, and I will undertake to withdraw them from the King." Better than anyone else he was acquainted with the rural population of Anjou and the Vendée and knew well how to manage them. He fulfilled his promise. To bend the most faithful partisans of the old monarchy, he spread the rumor that Bonaparte was a secret friend of the Bourbons and would soon bring them back into power. This deception was but one of the countless perfidies for which his enemies reproached him. After the conclusion of the peace, Bernier settled at Paris. As throughout most of his life, he there filled an enigmatic role. He received numerous Chouans, who came to consult him about the conduct they ought to follow, and he was received familiarly by the first consul, who recognized in him a force that he would make an instrument of his schemes when the suitable moment arrived.

---

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[38] "I have no fear," wrote Cardinal Mathieu, "in pointing out to the young men connected with the Quai d'Orsay, Consalvi's instructions to Spina as a model for study and a masterpiece of honest and prudent diplomacy." A summary of these instructions will be found in Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801*, pp. 60–71.

[39] At this period, the priests, apart from their ecclesiastical functions, generally dressed as laymen. Even Spina was obliged to follow this practice.

That moment had come. Kept acquainted with Bonaparte's intentions, Bernier, at this first interview, broached the chief conditions set down by the first consul, especially the full renewal of the episcopate.

The next day Bonaparte received Spina at Malmaison and "spoke most respectfully of the Holy Father." [40] The papal envoy wrote to the Cardinal Secretary of State that he was satisfied with this beginning.[41]

The conferences between Spina and Bernier continued without serious incident, at least apparently, until the end of 1800, either in the little chamber of the Archbishop of Corinth at the Hôtel de Rome or in the modest apartment occupied by Bernier on the third floor of the Hôtel d'Orléans, rue des Petits-Augustins.[42] On December 21, the Gazette de France published the following note: "Announcement is made of a coming peace between the Republic and the Holy See." Father Emery wrote: "I continue to believe that we are approaching a solution." [43]

---

[40] Letter from Spina to Consalvi (November 12, 1800), quoted by Boulay de la Meurthe, I, 23.

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] The rue des Petits-Augustins is the part of the present rue Bonaparte between the Quai and the rue Jacob.

[43] Boulay de la Meurthe, I, 169.

The negotiations were not so far advanced as was imagined by those on the outside. Spina, conforming to the prudent instruction of Cardinal Consalvi, listened to Bernier's different proposals: general resignation of the bishops, legalization of all the confiscations of Church property, the first consul's right to nominate the new bishops. The representative of the Holy See made a few amendments to the first point,[44] and to the second merely offered some objections of principle; but, with regard to Bonaparte's claim to name the new bishops, he had clear instructions from the Secretary of State, and urged them strongly. "The first consul wished to inherit the right of episcopal nominations which the kings of France had possessed. But did he, like them, make public profession of the Catholic religion? Did he recognize it as the religion of the state? If not, he should be satisfied with the regime established in England, Prussia, and Russia for the ecclesiastical benefices. Those who wished to profit by the inheritance from the Bourbons, should at least accept the burdens of it."

First Proposals

The Archbishop of Corinth sent a faithful report of all these incidents to Consalvi. On the advice of the latter, in opposition to a first concordat project put forth by Bernier on November 26, he presented a counterproposal, which he communicated to Consalvi in the middle of December. To this proposal the French government replied by a second project, which, not being agreed to, gave way to a third, then to a fourth, and finally to a fifth, entirely written in Bonaparte's own hand. This last project was submitted to Spina on February 2, 1801.

But at that moment a new incident arose. Along with Bonaparte's chief claim, on which clearly he would not yield, namely, the right to appoint the bishops, was expressed another claim, equally unacceptable, of the minister of foreign affairs, Tallyrand. This former bishop of Autun had entered into a union with an English divorcée, Mrs. Gand, and plainly intended to marry her civilly and religiously. But Talleyrand did not wish a concordat that would not recognize the legality of that union. The first consul, desiring to satisfy his minister, pretended, according to his custom, to settle the question with a single stroke. In the fifth project, presented on February 2, he himself had drawn up an article in these words: "The ecclesiastics who have, since their consecration, entered into bonds of matrimony or who, by other acts, have notoriously renounced the ecclesiastical state, will enter the class of simple citizens and will, like these, be admitted to lay communion." [45] Spina made clear that the words "or who, by other acts, have notoriously renounced the ecclesiastical state" would never be accepted at Rome. On February 23 he wrote to Rome: "I do not know whether Talleyrand wishes to be included in this provision. But I have made known that neither a bishop nor anyone who is bound by solemn vows can enjoy the apostolic indulgence." [46]

---

[44] For the system proposed by Spina, see Pisani, IV, 112.

The two capital difficulties had been broached. How would they be solved? Neither Pius VII nor Bonaparte wished to abandon the project of a concordat. The Roman court sought to gain time. Pius VII had organized at Rome, along with the recent congregation of extraordinary affairs, a small congregation made up of four cardinals whose office was to study the questions arising at Paris. To obviate any surprise, Consalvi repeated that Spina was merely a *missus ad audiendum et referendum,* in other words, that he was to listen to everything, discuss everything, observe everything, but conclude nothing and to refer everything to Rome. "Bonaparte," says Albert Lorel, "saw through the game and procrastinated on his side."

---

[45] Boulay de la Meurthe, I, 353.

[46] *Ibid.,* II, 63.

His temperament led him to make abrupt decisions and *coups d'état;* but he knew how to await the occasion.

Diplomatic Activities

That occasion was not slow in coming. The peace of Luneville (February 9, 1901), by settling the abasement of the house of Austria, gave the first consul a new prestige. To this he wished to add a title and the pope's recognition: he gave up the idea of the Roman Republic and returned to the Holy See its states such as they were in 1797, that is, diminished only by the loss of Romagna and the Legations. Then he proceeded to act with vigor.

Bonaparte was well aware that his fifth concordat project was examined at Rome by the two cardinalitial congregations. Summoning Spina, he gave him a prompt reply and, to hasten the solution, sent to Rome a cleverly chosen extraordinary agent. This man was François de Cacault, a Breton whose qualities of decision and whose abilities the first consul appreciated at the treaty of Tolentino. His sincere and solid religious faith had already made him appreciated at Rome. From the political angle he called himself "a reformed revolutionary." He held the modern ideas with the distinguished manners of a man of the ancient regime.

Cacault, reaching Rome on April 8, was well received by the Secretary of State, who communicated to him the results of the labors by the Roman Congregations. After lengthy discussions, the cardinals decided to go to the extreme limit of concessions. The Holy See would grant the first consul the right to name the bishops, who would then receive canonical institution by the Holy See; the Pope dispensed from the obligation of restitution those who had acquired ecclesiastical property. He also agreed, in concert with the government, to establish new boundaries of the French dioceses; but he required: (1) that the laws contrary to the dogmas and discipline of the Church should be abrogated, and (2) that the Catholic religion should be recognized as that of the great majority of French citizens.[47] With this project, Pius VII sent a long letter, written by his own hand, in which, with gentle and firm language, he gave the first consul the reasons why he could not sacrifice certain fundamental articles. "You will understand," he said, "that what would be re-established in France would not be the Catholic religion but a different religion if we were to sanction by our concessions any of the maxims that we must reprove." [48] On the question especially concerning priests who were married during the Revolution, the Pope explained his stand with a fatherly kindness: "As to the absolution of the married priests, and as to the absolution of those who may have withdrawn from the Church in other ways, we will provide by issuing the powers necessary so that they may be absolved according to the regulations and ecclesiastical discipline, assuring you that we consider our duty is to show them the effects of every fatherly condescension as far as it can be extended." [49]

All these labors of discussion and revision had lasted to the 12th of May. This is the date of the papal letter. On the next day a special messenger was on the way with it to Paris, where he arrived on May 23. But this messenger of peace passed on the way a messenger from Bonaparte, bearing a tempest with him.

The first consul's patience was exhausted. About him the foes of the concordat were spreading evil reports. As the delay increased, secret motives were looked for: that Rome was intriguing with Austria, England, or Russia, and trying to gain time that she might shake loose from France.[50] Grégoire insinuated his habitual suggestions on "the bad faith of the Roman court." Talleyrand, taking umbrage at Rome's refusal of the clause relative to his future marriage, urged the first consul to act with energy. On May 19, 1801, Bonaparte sent to Rome an ultimatum which may be summed up in these terms: "If, within five days, the Pope has not accepted the first consul's project, all further relations will be broken off. Cacault was to leave Rome and withdraw to Florence." [51] The ultimatum reached the Holy Father on May 29. At the same time the Pope received letters from Spina, informing him that the first consul, now incensed, threatened to make his decision without regarding the Church, charged Conslavi with treason, and spoke of invading the States of the Church and of becoming a Protestant.

---

[47] See the complete text in Mathieu, pp. 145–48.

[48] The text of this letter was published for the first time by Cardinal Mathieu, *op. cit.*, pp. 150–53.

[49] Bernard de Lacombe, "Le mariage de Talleyrand," in *Le Correspondant*, August 25, 1905, p. 677.

The situation was critical. The Roman commission of extraordinary affairs met and declared the proposal of the first consul unacceptable. This would be the rupture with the direst consequences.

A courageous and clever inspiration of Cacault saved the situation. The French negotiator [52] had brought with him as secretary an intelligent young man, Artaud, the future historian of Pius VII, who relates the incident in his touching pages.

> This able minister requested me to visit him and, after I read the letter, he said to me: "I must obey my government; but a government must have at its head one who understands the negotiations, and ministers who advise him well, and that all this be understood. . . . We all know that the head of the state wishes a concordat; he has wished it for a long time past; for that very purpose he sent me here and he has given me as aide the very one I would desire. . . . Neither of us

---

[50] Pisani, IV, 131.

[51] Boulay de la Meurthe, II, 419–22; Mathieu, p. 179.

[52] Cacault did not receive the official title of minister of France until after the signing of the concordat.

is a bad Christian. I have indeed seen what you have been up to the present; as for myself, I am a reformed revolutionary. . . . On the other hand, I like Bonaparte, I like the general. . . . But you know that, even though liking him very much, I call him under my breath 'the little tiger,' to describe his figure, his tenacity, his agility. . . . Well then, the little tiger has made a mistake, one that can be repaired. But I have need of everyone. . . . If you help me, you will perhaps be enough, the two of us will be enough, for no one ever corrects with impunity those who govern."

I replied to the minister that I keenly desired to see a concordat concluded, and that in all things I would follow in his steps. . . . He went at once to Cardinal Consalvi, read to him the formidable dispatch without suppressing a single word. Then he added: "Some misunderstandings are present. The first consul does not know you. Go to Paris." "When?" asked the Cardinal. "Tomorrow," I answered. "You will please him, you will understand each other; he will see what is a cardinal, a man of acuteness; you will make the concordat with him." [53]

Cacault had judged aright. Only one man was competent to overcome the formidable difficulty. That man was the eminent Secretary of State, who had, till then, so prudently directed the negotiations from a distance: he was a polished gentleman, conciliatory, cultured, whose charm Bonaparte appreciated; he was the irreproachable ecclesiastic, whose lofty dignity made an impression on everybody in the most critical moments. The expedient suggested by Cacault seemed to the Pope and to the cardinals, who were all consulted, the only remaining chance of avoiding the rupture with France and all the ills that would ensue.[54] Cacault withdrew to Florence, and Consalvi set out for Paris, while the representative of France notified Talleyrand of the coming arrival of the Cardinal Secretary of State in the French capital.

---

[53] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Pie VII* (3rd ed., 1839), I, 108. This account, written soon after the events, has been confirmed as authentic and exact by Cacault. *Ibid.*, p. 108 note.

[54] Mathieu, p. 191.

Consalvi and Bonaparte

Consalvi reached Paris June 20 and took up lodging in the Hôtel de Rome with Spina and Caselli. The next day Bonaparte summoned him to an interview to take place the day following. Consalvi's *Mémoires* gives us a striking picture of this audience, in which everything was calculated by the first consul to overawe, fascinate, and disconcert the Cardinal and to wring from him a reply favorable to the wishes of the French government.

> At the appointed hour I arrived at the Tuileries. . . . I was brought into a reception room on the ground floor. There I remained alone, without anything to look at about me except a deep solitude. A few moments later, the master of ceremonies pointed to a little door. As I passed through this I experienced the same surprise as a person feels in a theater at the sudden change of scene, when from a cottage or a prison the scene changes to the dazzling sight of a magnificent court.

The day was, in fact, one of state pomp at the Tuileries. Consalvi describes the grandiose picture that struck his eye: the troops lined up on the stairs and in the halls, paying him military honors as he passed. Others present were the gentlemen and dignitaries of the palace, the generals in full uniform, the members of the Tribunate, of the Senate, and of the legislative body; then, surrounded by the ministers of state and other high officials in festive attire, the first consul in full dress. Bonaparte, profiting by the supposed amazement of the Cardinal, came up to him, majestic and courteous, haughty and cheerful. Protesting his veneration for the Pope, he repeated against the court of Rome the most injurious accusations and finally announced the presentation of a last project. He said: "I wish absolutely that you sign it within five days."

The Cardinal, at first disconcerted, had time to gain his self-control. He himself relates in his *Mémoires:* "By a special grace of heaven, and nowise by my own merit, I replied to each point what I might say without stirring up dissension and without letting any complaint against Rome go without a suitable justifying reply." [55] At a nod from the first consul the audience was ended, and Consalvi departed, divided between hope and fear.

At bottom the impression produced by Consalvi had been good. Bonaparte, who always esteemed, even among those who opposed him, self-possession, courage, and intelligence, recognized these qualites in the Secretary of State. On June 25 Consalvi wrote: "The government is heaping attentions on me. Yesterday the first consul invited me to dinner, at which he showed me all possible courtesy." The cause of the Holy See was half won.

On June 27 the Cardinal received the famous project already announced. But this project, the seventh,[56] did not take into account the observations already made. Out-and-out Consalvi refused to sign it; calling to his aid Spina and Caselli, during the following night he drew up a counterproject, accompanied by a long memorial, which at an early hour the next morning he sent to Bernier.

Talleyrand had left Paris for the waters of Bourbon-l'Archambault. Had Bonaparte, remembering that Pius VII had expressed to him the desire of not seeing at the bottom of the concordat the signature of a bishop who had broken away from the Church, removed his minister from the scene for the time being? Or did the latter, seeing that his attempt had failed, withdraw of his own accord? The fact is that, with the departure of Talleyrand, the largest of the difficulties seemed to be ironed out. Consalvi made known to the first consul that the question of the marriage of the apostate priests was in the category of disciplinary matters and that the Church had as great interest as did the state in bringing peace to these unfortunates.[57]

---

[55] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* I, 328.

[56] A sixth project (April 17) was proposed to Spina but was dropped because of the incidents related above.

Bonaparte no longer spoke of his ultimatum. The five days' delay had run out. A single major difficulty remained: the question of the consuls' profession of the Catholic faith, which the Pope presented as a condition for the right of nominating bishops. An eighth project, presented by Bernier, passed over this point in silence. But (July 12) each side had the impression that the end was near; a decree of the consuls fixed the morrow for the signing of the treaty. In place of the minister of foreign affairs, who was absent from Paris, it would be signed by the first consul's brother, Joseph Bonaparte, and by the Counsellor of State, Crétet. On the day following, Bonaparte would solemnly promulgate it.

But on the 13th, upon glancing over the text that he was invited to sign, Consalvi was startled. Talleyrand, whose friends kept him informed of the proceedings, had his tool, the apostate priest Hauterive, insert an article permitting the marriage of the priests who had abandoned the Church during the Revolution. Other modifications also had been introduced into the project. The Cardinal refused to affix his signature to the document. A long discussion ensued between the plenipotentiaries, which lasted without interruption from eight o'clock of the evening of July 14 until four o'clock the next afternoon. Said Consalvi: "We took merely a bite of breakfast in the morning, for which we had little fancy." The clause about the marriage of priests was removed.[58] Finally the discussion boiled down to two points: Would the Catholic religion be declared the religion of France; would the police regulation of public worship be in the hands of the state? Mutual concessions were made. These provided that the Catholic religion would be declared the religion of the majority of Frenchmen, and that the police regulation of worship would be in the hands of the state, but only for what concerned public peace and security. In short, agreement was reached. Then, through scrupulous concern, Joseph wished, before signing the final text, to communicate it to his brother. He went to the Tuileries. There he found the first consul exasperated by these delays. Seeing that new modifications had been made, Bonaparte, violently tearing the paper in pieces, threw them into the fire. Once again, everything seemed to be lost.

---

[57] Boulay de la Meurthe, III, 162; VI, 76.

[58] After the signing of the Concordat, Talleyrand returned to his charge, increased his earnest requests to obtain from the Pope the permission to marry. All he obtained was a brief (June 29, 1802) which lifted the excommunication imposed on him and granted him lay Communion. But he did not receive the permission to marry. The first consul, however, interpreted the brief in his own way: a consular decree, inserted in the *Bulletin des lois*, declared that it gave full effect to the papal

By Consalvi's self-control all was saved. The first consul had ordered for the 14th of July a national festivity, and a magnificent dinner with 250 places was prepared. At the banquet he expected to announce the great news. Upon Consalvi's arrival, he exploded, in the presence of his guests, in one of those outbursts in which no one could say whether they were calculated or spontaneous. He delivered invectives against the Pope, the cardinals, the Roman policy, even indulging in gross and brutal insult. The calmness of the Cardinal, who more than once restrained on his lips a ready and irritating reply, disarmed Bonaparte, and cooled his anger. The text of the last accord, of which a second copy had fortunately been made, was then placed before his eyes, and seemed to him not so

---

brief, putting the minister of foreign affairs in the secular and lay state, leaving the impression that he had the right to marry. Consequently (September 10, 1802) Talleyrand married Mrs. Gand at the town hall of the tenth arrondissement of Paris. Was this civil union followed by a nuptial blessing at Epinay? Some, without positive proof, have held that it was. At any rate, the religious marriage would have been vitiated by radical nullity. On this subject, see Bernard de Lacombe, "Le mariage de Talleyrand," in the *Correspondant* for August 25 and September 10, 1905.

inadmissible as its first reading had made it appear. Yet he proposed some changes and authorized a final conference for the next day.

Not until eleven o'clock the next evening, after engaging in a long and minute examination of each word, did the plenipotentiaries reach an accord. Joseph Bonaparte had little liking for the task of going again to his brother and running into a fresh outburst of wrath. At two o'clock in the morning a happy event made him decide. Word was brought to him that he was a father for the third time. The plenipotentiaries acclaimed the happy news, and Joseph, taking courage, undertook the office of announcing to the first consul the birth of his nephew and the signing of the Concordat. Bonaparte, without objection, gave his final ratification. A new era would now open for the Church of France. A renewal was prepared for the whole Church.

The New Concordat

The treaty signed by the plenipotentiaries of the Holy See and those of the French government did not realize the ideal of the relations that ought to exist between the Church and the state. What human institution has ever done so? But it established a *modus vivendi* acceptable in the given circumstances. Unlike the concordat of 1516, that of 1801 was, in form as well as in substance, a reciprocal contract, concluded between the spiritual power and the temporal power. By the approval of the pope and of the first consul, it would become the law of the Church and the law of the state. The text contained a preamble and seventeen articles.

By the preamble "the government of the Republic recognized that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is that of the great majority of the French people" and particularly "that of the consuls." The seventeen articles regulated in a general way the condition of ecclesiastical persons, the status of the

Church property, and the role of the state with regard to the Church. The bishops will henceforth be appointed in accordance with a new arrangement of diocesan boundaries, established by the Holy See in agreement with the government (article 2); the pastors in a new arrangement of parish boundaries, made by the bishop and approved by the government (article 9). The bishops will be named by the government and instituted by the pope "following the forms established in France before the change of government" (article 4).

"His Holiness declares that neither he nor his successors will in any way trouble those who have acquired Church property" (article 13); the government "will assure a suitable revenue for the bishops and the pastors (article 14) and will guarantee to the Catholics the freedom to make foundations in favor of their churches" (article 15).

"The first consul will enjoy with the Holy See the same rights and prerogatives as those enjoyed by the former government" (article 16); but, in the event that one of his successors should not be a Catholic, these rights and prerogatives will be regulated by a new agreement (article 17).

By virtue of a transient arrangement, the pope must ask the former bishops for their resignations and, in case they refuse, he must proceed to the appointment of new bishops (article 3).

In their general lines such were the dispositions of this diplomatic convention, one of the most important to be met with in the history of the Church. From one point of view it seemed to ratify the political results of the French Revolution, since "the papacy recognized in the first consul of the French Republic the same rights and prerogatives as were enjoyed by the former government," namely, the rights and prerogatives of that traditional monarchy whose kings had all been consecrated by the Church; and, in this first respect, the Church would arouse among some royalists defiances hard to overcome. But, in the other respect, the papacy emerged from the crisis greater than ever. The Revolution had begun by pretending to regulate at its own pleasure the discipline of the Church; brought to a stand as in an impasse, it had been obliged to recognize that it could do nothing without the pope; and for the pope it recognized a heretofore unheard-of right, or at least a right which no pontiff had previously made use of: that of removing by his own lawful authority all the bishops of France, for the purpose of re-establishing religious peace. The consequences of this act would be far-reaching, extending over the entire world. As Taine says, "an indestructible precedent was set up." [59] In the structure the corner stone was recognized to be the papacy. Since the French concordat of 1801, more than thirty concordats have been concluded between the Holy See and the different states, not only of the Old World, but also of the New, and everywhere they have the same character; wherever the revolutionary spirit, after upsetting the traditional organisms, would necessitate an ecclesiastical reorganization, it has opened paths to a more direct and unremitting action of the papacy on the reconstituted Christianities. "In this way," concludes Taine, "all the great existing churches of the Catholic universe are the work of the Pope, his latest work, his own creation attested by a positive act of contiguous date. . . . None of them can assert or even believe itself legitimate without declaring the superior authority to be legitimate which has just endowed it with life and being." [60] The Terror had made the Church more clearly aware of its faith and piety; the Concordat established its ancient hierarchy on more solid foundations.[61]

Ratification of the Concordat

The agreement, signed at Paris on July 15, 1801, by the plenipotentiaries, had to be ratified by the pope and the first consul within forty days. Pius VII's signature was put to it on August 15, that of Bonaparte on September 8, and the official exchange of ratifications took place on September 10. On August 27 the Pope designated to represent him at Paris as his legate *a latere* Cardinal Caprara, who had already, under Pius VI, filled the posts of nuncio at Lucerne and Vienna. There he had ably defended the Holy See against the undertakings of Kaunitz and Joseph II. But the mission entrusted to him by Pius VII presented a different sort of difficulty. Charged with watching over the execution of the Concordat, he would have to contend at the same time with the formalism of Portalis, the slippery politics of Talleyrand, and the calculated violence of Bonaparte. At no time could he count on Bernier's support, which was timid and not altogether sure.

---

[59] Taine, *The Modern Regime*, II, 48.

[60] Taine, *op. cit.*, II, 50.

[61] For the text of the Concordat, see pp. 562–74.

Traps were set for him on all sides. Caprara could not avoid all of them. On March 30, 1802, Portalis, taking advantage of a moment of weariness and emotion in which the nuncio was placed after a long discussion with the first consul, read to him a regulation that would later be published under the title of "the organic articles." Caprara, not having the text before his eyes, listened but, as he declared in a letter, he did not grasp the exact import of the document, yet he did request that some changes be made in it. He was promised that these modifications would be made. Without further formality, on April 5, Portalis presented to the Chambers, as constituting something indivisible, the concordat followed by the organic articles.[62] The legislative body, on April 8, by 228 votes against 21, passed the new law, which, not having been attacked in the ten days in the Senate as unconstitutional, became (April 18, 1802) a law of the Republic.

Early Easter morning (April 18) the great bell of Notre Dame, which had been silent for ten years, began to ring. At the hour for High Mass, the consuls in red dress, the ministers and the ambassadors in uniform, and the general officers in full dress uniform, entered the cathedral, where the new archbishop of Tours, Archbishop de Boisgelin, preached a special sermon for the occasion. The solemnity closed with the chanting of the *Te Deum.* The popular emotion ran high. We are told that in the streets people wept and embraced one another and that one resident of the Ile Saint-Louis fell dead through his overwhelming impression of joy.[63]

---

[62] Boulay de La Meurthe, V, 276–79, 297–391, 407.

This joy extended to all of France. Most of the churches had already been reopened, but until then many of them were shared with the constitutionals; in these places Catholic worship was celebrated with timidity and apprehension, almost in hiding.[64] On the morrow of the Notre Dame solemnity the public worship resumed its ancient splendor. Again processions passed along the streets and in the public squares; again were to be seen the grand liturgical celebrations and the spontaneous manifestations of piety. The seminaries opened once more,[65] the chapters were again organized, the vestry boards were again established, foundations in favor of churches increased, priests no longer were afraid to appear in public in ecclesiastical dress,[66] hospices, prisons, and lyceums received chaplains. In an allocution delivered on May 24, 1802, the Supreme Pontiff gave expression to the universal joy when he said: "What a new spectacle France presents to the whole world at this moment! The temples of the Host High are again open, the sheep are again restored to their lawful shepherds, the sacraments of the Church are again publicly administered, the standard of the cross is again unfurled, and the supreme head of the Church is solemnly recognized: such are the immense blessings for which we must rejoice in the Lord." [67] Consequently the Pope invited the Catholics of France to celebrate a jubilee of thanksgiving.

---

[63] Pisani, *Le clergé de Paris et la Révolution,* IV, 286.

[64] L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* I, 292–98.

[65] The first consul (October 6, 1802) returned to its former use the seminary of St. Sulpice, at that time occupied by women of ill repute, who, on his orders, were then brought to Bicêtre (*Correspondance de Napoléon 1er,* VIII, 79). In 1800, profiting by the relative calm then prevailing, Father Emery had grouped together, under the direction of his confrere, Father Duclaux, a few young seminarians in a house on rue Saint-Jacques. Wearing lay dress, the seminarians took their recreations by walks along the neighboring boulevards. Dogma was taught by Father Frayssinous, moral by Father Fournier (future bishop of Montpellier), and canon law and history by Father Emery, who, more suspect than the others, did not lodge in the house with the others but on rue d'Enfer and came from there for his classes. At the beginning of 1801 the number of students was thirty; among them were two future bishops (Quelen and Feutrier) and a brilliant young man who became the founder of Stanislas College, Father Liautard.

[66] In 1801 the priests, without yet venturing to resume the cassock at Paris, had begun to wear a large black cloak. Lanzac de Laborie, *op. cit.,* p. 296.

The Organic Articles

This joy was not unmixed, and this triumph was traversed by many a trial. The organic articles, which the first consul had rapidly communicated to Caprara in a sort of surprise ambush, were in some aspects the very negation of the concordat agreement.

Says a certain French jurist:

> We should not confuse, as was sometimes formerly done, these organic articles of the year X with the concordat itself, although they were part of the same law of the state. The concordat, agreed to between the two powers, is a law both of the Church and of the state. The organic articles, the work exclusively of the French government, were never submitted to the pope or approved by him. Bonaparte presented them as a law intended to regulate the details of the concordat and to assure its execution. In reality he sought, in a roundabout fashion, to go back on certain compromises that he had been obliged to make in his first projects. Taking his inspiration from principles formulated in the Gallican Declaration of 1682, he endeavored to re-establish to his own advantage over the new Church of France the rights which the absolute kings had formerly arrogated to themselves with regard to the Church. He used this procedure as a means of holding the clergy in his hand, in the hope of making them serve his interests.
>
> In the promulgation of the organic articles, Bonaparte pretended to

---

[67] Barberi, *Bullarium,* XI, 335-39.

be exercising the police right which the concordat recognized with regard to public worship. He was not unaware that he was exceeding these rights. The concordat had, in fact, after long and minute negotiations, restrained this right of police to the cases in which the public tranquillity would be involved. But the organic articles started by repeating: 1. the old Gallican rules relative to the verification of the acts of the Holy See and of the decrees of synods held in other countries, "even those of general councils," which must be submitted to the *placet* (articles 1 and 2); 2. the bishops were forbidden to meet in council or synod in France without the authorization of the government (article 4), or to leave their dioceses, even for the purpose of going to Rome, without an express permission (article 20); 3. the old appeal as from an abuse, under the form of recourse to the Council of State (article 6). All these measures had been, in the course of the negotiations, the object of sharp opposition on the part of the papal envoys.

The organic articles then proceeded to take up questions with regard to discipline, to doctrine, and even to dogma, that is, questions purely spiritual, which are outside the competence of the civil power, and with regard to which several articles were in contradiction to the canons and even to the concordat which they were supposed to apply. Such were the following: article 10, which abolished "every privilege carrying exemption from episcopal jurisdiction"; article 11, which subordinated to the authorization of the government the establishment of chapters and seminaries that the concordat authorized; articles 13, 14, 15, which determined the pastoral duties of the archbishops and bishops; article 24, imposing on seminary professors the obligation "of subscribing to the Declaration of 1682 and of teaching the doctrine therein contained"; article 29, which prescribed the adoption in France of a single catechism and a single liturgy; article 26, which, contrary to the canons, fixed the age and the conditions required for the ordination of priests. To justify the organic articles, Portalis said: "They did not introduce a new right and were but a new sanction of the old maxims of the Gallican Church." This fact was precisely what condemned them.

The organic articles were the source of further quarrels with the Holy See. In consistory (May 24, 1802) the Pope vehemently protested against the duplicity of the first consul. He then charged Caprara to protest to Talleyrand against these articles, "that His Holiness had not been invited to examine and that essentially involved the customs, discipline, rights, instruction, and jurisdiction of the Church." To Caprara's long letter (August 18, 1803) Portalis replied (September 22) by a still longer plea, in which he tried to justify Bonaparte. Another note from Cardinal Caprara, addressed to Talleyrand on the subject of Napoleon's coronation, showed to the latter that the Pope persisted in distinguishing between the concordat, which he had accepted, and "the so-called organic laws, in which several articles could not accord with the principles and maxims of the Church." This time (July 18, 1804) Talleyrand replied: "The concordat is the result of the will of the two contracting parties. The organic laws, on the contrary, are merely the manner of extension adopted by one of these two powers. The manner is susceptible of change and improvement, according to circumstances. No one can therefore, without injustice, confound the one with the other in the same expressions." Cardinal Consalvi, in the name of the Pope, made note of Talleyrand's declaration by which "the seventeen articles of the concordat agreed upon with the Holy See are utterly separate from the organic laws, to which they were attached in the decree of 18 Germinal of the year X," and which His Holiness hopes "to have His Imperial Majesty change and improve." [68] The Pope's hope was not well founded. He was able to obtain nothing from Napoleon and could do nothing more than repeat his most vigorous protests, notably in his bull *Quam memorandam* of June 10, 1809.[69]

Religious Situation

In the negotiations of the concordat, Pius VII had the consolation of seeing the great mass of his bishops, priests, and faithful take their stand around his sovereign authority. The abjurations of the constitutional priests were made in great number. From the documents published by Taine, we are led to suppose that the number of the faithful who remained attached to the Church of the oath did not, in 1801, exceed a tenth of the population; in other words, out of a population of 35,000,000 of Frenchmen and of 30,000,000 Catholics, 27,000,000 remained united to the pope.[70] The constitutionals who still followed the directions of Grégoire were perhaps more ardent than ever. They had begun by making a desperate opposition to the concordat; then soon, seeing the uselessness of their efforts, they accepted the treaty; but they did so in the hope of turning it to their profit. In fact, we see their activity, their cleverness, and especially their almost unbelievable tenacity, permit them to keep a part of their positions and obtain, if not all the honors of war, at least an advantageous capitulation.[71]

---

[68] Letter of August 28, 1804.

[69] Emile Chénon, professor in the law faculty of the University of Paris, in the *Histoire générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud (IX, 263–66). Cf. Gaudry, *Traité de la législation des cultes,* 1854; *Ami de la religion* (August 1, 1854); Dudon, "La réponse de Portalis à la note du cardinal Caprara sur les articles organiques," in the *Revue historique de droit,* 1907 (XXI), 269–309.

Bonaparte never had a taste for the constitutional Church; he called it "a comedy played by some ideologists and schemers." Nevertheless, while he was negotiating the concordat, whether because he was feeling his way or because he wished to intimidate the Pope, he allowed the constitutionals to meet in councils. Several provincial councils were held, notably at Rouen and Bourges in 1800. A national council opened its sessions on June 21, 1801, at the very time of Consalvi's arrival in Paris. It was presided over by Le Coz, metropolitan of Rennes, who had already been president of the conciliar assembly of 1797. The solemn sessions were held in Notre Dame. Thirty-nine departments were represented. This body, like a headquarters' staff, wished to give the impression that it had a large army behind it. But such was not at all the fact. The holding of this pseudo-council did not deeply move public opinion. The members of the assembly were well aware of this fact. They contented themselves with protesting their obedience to the established powers, writing to the Pope to beg him "to second their efforts" toward religious peace and to express to him all their earnest desires in the undertaking of a concordat "which would put an end to the religious dissensions." They did not even attempt to carry out the vast plan of reforms which they had conceived. Even had they wished to do so, their internal discussions and an order of Fouché ordering them to dissolve (August 25), would not have given them time for it.[72] The concordat had just been ratified by the Pope: Fouché no longer felt the need of shaking before him the bugbear of a schismatic council.

---

[70] Taine, *Les origines*, X, 47 note; reports of Barbé-Marbois on Brittany, of François de Nantes on Vaucluse and Provence, of Lacuée on Paris and the seven neighboring departments. In some departments, as in the Vosges, the constitutionals were stronger; but in others, their Church was completely reduced to nothing. Pisani, IV, 157, 185.

[71] Pisani, IV, 154.

But a man of Grégoire's stamp was not ready to surrender without a fight. He knew that in the government he was backed by Talleyrand, who, although laicized, always had the feelings of a father for the constitutional Church and gladly became its advocate in the council of the ministers. Talleyrand soon found occasion to act thus.

The first five concordat projects contained a more or less explicit mention of the juring priests; but the text finally adopted was silent on the subject. Moreover, when (July 24, 1801) the first consul, in a conference with Consalvi, introduced the question of the rehabilitation of the constitutional bishops, the conversation became stormy. "What are you asking of these bishops," said Bonaparte, "to reconcile them with the Church?" Consalvi answered: "A retraction, that is, the acknowledgment of their errors and acceptance of the papal briefs." "They will never retract," the consul angrily replied. "A man who retracts dishonors himself. I would be the first to despise him. I wish to name eight or nine bishops drawn from the constitutional clergy, but not from those who make a retraction. Arrange for their return into the Church, but do not ask from them any act contrary to honor." [73]

---

[72] See the report of these provincial assemblies and of the national council in the *Annales de la religion.*

This attitude of the first consul was the result of Talleyrand's perfidious insinuations. The constitutionals did indeed wish to return to the Church, but to do so without bowing their heads, without abjuring anything. Bernier himself pleaded their cause. "The government," he said, "would not suffer that they should appear to abjure the results of the Revolution." [74] By the efforts of diplomacy, the Holy See succeeded in having the first consul accept the text of a brief which the Pope addressed to Spina regarding the constitutional priests. This brief, as Bernier himself avows, "was filled with a spirit of condescension and charity." But it did not have the expected success. Its import, authority, and authenticity were discussed. Then Bonaparte, who had expressed his fear of seeing the constitutional priests "dishonor themselves" by obedience to the head of the Church, did not hesitate to call on them, in the name of the state, to hand in their resignation. Portalis, after conferring with several of them, drew up the formula which almost all signed and then sent it to the Pope through Spina. They said: "We profess to the Sovereign Pontiff, lawful successor of St. Peter, obedience and submission, conformably to the canons and the holy decrees of the Church." [75] These last words offered some ambiguity, but Caprara was at pains to see each of the bishops and, by oral explanations, to give the formula an orthodox meaning.

Two constitutional bishops (Grégoire of Loir-et Cher and Moïse of the Jura) wished to give their letters of resignation some appearance of blustering manifestation. The first consul was not satisfied with these bishops and systematically removed them from the new hierarchy formed by the Concordat. He who had been the undisputed head of the constitutional Church became in retirement the center of a small group of impenitent constitutional priests. He died, himself impenitent, on April 24, 1831.

---

[73] This conversation is related by Consalvi in a dispatch addressed to Cardinal Doria. Boulay de la Meurthe, III, 292.

[74] *Ibid.*, III, 313.

[75] For Caprara's letter to Consalvi, see Boulay de La Meurthe, IV, 164.

Twelve juring priests had places in the new episcopate. Two of these (Charrier de La Roche of Versailles, and Montault des Iles of Angers) humbly submitted. But the others boasted for a long time that they had nothing to retract in their past life. Those who resisted longest made their submission, more or less sincere, only in 1804, and the bulls of confirmation of their election did not arrive from Rome until June 17, 1805.[76]

Resistance of *Emigré* Bishops

The impenitent constitutionals unfortunately had occasion to note, among the most ardent of their political adversaries, acts of disobedience which they maliciously compared with their own revolt. In a letter signed by thirteen *émigré* bishops in England, we read these words:

> Most Holy Father, we are obliged to refuse to you the customary obedience. . . . The experience of the countless calamities that have been desolating our fatherland for many years makes us fear that the universal and simultaneous abandonment of all the sees will be, for the Catholic faith, only a new source of evils; and it pertains only to a general assembly of the bishops of the Gallican Church to make known to Your Holiness the surest means of avoiding these evils.[77]

Of the nineteen *émigré* bishops in England, only five submitted; the other fourteen showed themselves openly refractory. This example had lamentable consequences. At the end of November word had already come from Germany that four episcopal resignations had been made as against eleven refusals. As for the eleven bishops living in France, all of them, in terms of the most filial submission, gave the resignations asked of them. To cut short the problem, Pope Pius VII employed the supreme right belonging to the papacy in such events. By his bull *Qui Christi Domini vices* (November 29, 1801),[78] he declared that the 135 bishoprics of old France, those of Belgium, and those of the left bank of the Rhine, were suppressed; consequently, whether they handed in their resignations or not, the bishops lost all jurisdiction, since the object of that jurisdiction no longer existed.[79]

---

[76] Pisani, *L'episcopat constitutionnel,* p. 49.

[77] *Annales de la religion,* XIV, 412.

The greater part of the refractory bishops finally submitted. The chief motive of their insubmission had been of a political order. Being royalists, living in the atmosphere of the *émigré* nobility and affected by its influence, they were disinclined to lend themselves to any move that might in France sanction the Republican government.[80] But their deep Catholic spirit could not allow them to persist in their refusal in the presence of the formal expression of the Pope's will. Two among them, however, never rendered their submission, but even became the centers of a resistance which they encouraged by their official injunctions and their private letters. We are referring to Bishop Jean de Coucy of La Rochelle and particularly Bishop Alexandre de Thémines of Blois, who may be regarded as the founder of the sect of the anticoncordatists, and thereafter better known under the name of "The Little Church." Alexandre de Thémines had acquired at the court, where he was chaplain of King Louis XVI, and then was bishop of Blois, to which dignity he was raised at the age of thirty-four, the reputation for ardent piety, incorruptible virtue, and a strictness in conduct which was in striking contrast to the general morals of his surroundings. In the assembly of the clergy (1788) he alone raised his voice in favor of the parlement of Paris, which was then exiled at Troyes. Under the Revolution he had energetically refused to take any of the oaths and left his post only at the last moment (February 12, 1791) under the pressure of a peremptory injunction of the municipality and a popular uprising that put his life in danger. To the last moments of his life he would protest with all his might against the concordat concluded with Bonaparte, even refusing, in 1814, to return to France in answer to the appeal of Louis XVIII, for, as the inflexible prelate said, "to bring back a bishop into his country after so many storms, a restoration of the monarchy does not suffice; the religion of our fathers must be restored in full." Bishop Thémines had, however, before his death, the happiness of being reconciled with Rome.[81]

---

[78] Barberi, *Bullarium,* XI, 245.

[79] The number of the new bishoprics was reduced to sixty.

[80] See especially the memorial published by these bishops on June 8 and called *Déclaration dur les droits du Roi.*

The most compact group of the dissidents was formed in the Vendean Bocage, which belonged to the new diocese of Poitiers. Especially in Lower Poitou and the district of Lyons the name of The Little Church was given to these dissidents. Less important centers of resistance were formed in other districts. Under the various names of Clementines at Rouen, of Filochois at Tours, of Louisets at Rennes, of Enfarines at Rodez, and of Fideles in Provence, the anticoncordatists met in private oratories, refusing to participate in the ceremonies celebrated in concordatist churches or by priests who had submitted to the concordat. After Thémines' death in 1829, they no longer had any bishop at their head; in 1847 they lost their last priest. Important conversions brought about during these latter years seemed to forecast the approaching end of the sect.[82]

---

[81] Roussel, "Le centenaire de la Petite Eglise," in the *Correspondant,* March 10, 1903. The sect of foes of the concordat spread the rumor that Pius VII had ceded his spiritual rights in order to keep his temporal domain.

[82] On the Little Church, see Drochon, *La Petite Eglise;* Mangenot, under "Anticoncordataires" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie;* Latreille, *Après le Concordat,* 1910; Latreille, *La Petite Eglise de Lyon.*

The Significance of the Concordat

For the zeal of Pius VII, as also for the ambition of Bonaparte, the religious pacification of France was but a starting point. What each of them desired, with different points of view, was the religious pacification of the whole world. As has been rightly said, the intentions of the two contracting parties recalled the Holy Empire more than it did the old regime. Bonaparte was thinking of Charlemagne or, if you prefer, of Barbarossa and Frederick II, rather than of Louis XIV. Pius VII was pained at seeing the Catholics increasing the obstacles to his government. One day he said to Cacault: "Alas, I have real peace only in the government of the Catholics who are subjects of the infidels or of the heretics. You know all that my predecessor had to suffer from the changes carried out in Austria by the emperors Joseph and Leopold. You are witness of the assaults that are inflicted on me every day by the courts of Spain and Naples." [83] Nor did Italy spare the Pope many trials. The formation of the Cisalpine Republic had not only created Italian nationalism,[84] but it had also favored the diffusion of the revolutionary ideas in Italy. A proclamation (February 3. 1797), addressed to all the bishops by the ministers of the Republic, said to them: "Henceforth every document coming from the court of Rome will be *ipso facto* regarded as null." [85] In vain had General Bonaparte said: "We have given you liberty; know how to keep it; favor the spread of the lights and respect religion." [86] The bishops were forbidden to mention, in their pastoral letters, either the Holy See or the powers received therefrom. Bonaparte's celebrated discourse at Milan (June 6, 1799) had not calmed men's minds. On November 23, 1800, the first consul wrote to Talleyrand: "You will make known to citizen Jourdan and citizen Petiet (ministers of the Cisalpine Republic) that I am pained to see efforts being made to disquiet the priests." [87] To reassure the clergy, toward the end of 1801 he insinuated to the Cisalpine government the thought of accrediting a representative to the Holy See. The man chosen was the minister of France at Rome, Cacault. Then he directed Talleyrand to assemble at Lyons, by way of extraordinary consultation, the most prominent members of the Cisalpine Republic.

---

[83] Letter of Cacault to Talleyrand, quoted by Theiner, *Histoire des deux Concordats,* II, 25.

[84] Hazard, *La Révolution française et les lettres Italiennes;* Henry Cochin, "La Révolution française et l'Italie," in the *Correspondant* of October 25, 1911.

[85] Theiner, *op. cit.,* p. 2.

[86] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

From that time the religious affairs of Italy entered upon a path of appeasement. But not all the obstacles had disappeared; this improvement needed the indomitable energy of the first consul, the fine considerateness of Cacault, and the unalterable patience of Pius VII to surmount them and finally to arrive at a relative pacification.

The consultative representatives of the Cisalpine Republic met at Lyons in January, 1802. Contemporary witnesses in words of admiring praise, have described the spectacle of that great assembly, in which were to be seen 452 Italian notables, among whom were venerable prelates, "wishing to be present," as they said, "at the proclamation of the independence of their country by the hero who had brought it about." Bonaparte arrived on January 13, fixed the limits of the new state, gave it a constitution like the French constitution, and was proclaimed its first president. Two weeks later, at a most imposing session, the first consul, seated on a platform and surrounded by his family and his ministers, solemnly promulgated the new constitution. "You might have supposed you were seeing Charlemagne, assisted by the bishops, the great vassals of the empire, nobles and generals, drawing up laws for the Church and the state in the assemblies of Worms or Aix-la-Chapelle." [88]

---

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

This ceremony was, in fact, a preparation for the proclamation of the empire. For the first time, the first consul was there acclaimed under the two names joined together of Napoleon Bonaparte. One of the principal acts that he sanctioned was an ecclesiastical legislation, presented under the name of "organic laws" of the clergy and destined to lay the basis of an Italian concordat. The first article of the Cisalpine constitution proclaimed "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion the religion of the state," but the organic laws decided that "the bishops would be named by the government and would be instituted by the Holy See; that the pastors would be chosen and instituted by the bishop in agreement with the government; that the limits of the dioceses would be defined anew, if need be, in concert with the Holy See; that each diocese would have its seminary with endowment; that no property possessed by the Church could be sold; and that the clergy would be dispensed from all military service.[89]

The Pope expressed his satisfaction in a letter (March 18) to the first consul and appointed Cardinal Caprara for the negotiation of a concordat. But a decree (June 23, 1802) issued by the vice-president of the Cisalpine Republic, Melzi, seemed to destroy all the hopes based on the Lyons assembly. On the pretext of determining the functions of the minister of public worship, the new decree subjected to the approval of the civil power almost all the acts of the ecclesiastical minister.[90] Pius VII sent his indignant protests to Napoleon, who, passing over the decree signed by Melzi, presented (August 4) to the Holy Father a concordat project. But a formidable opposition arose among the chiefs of the Cisalpine state. Titanic outbursts were to be foreseen. To avoid these, Pius VII proposed to the first consul that any concordat project be renounced. The Pope said that the Church of Italy had not undergone so profound disturbances as the Church of France. Would not the situation be met sufficiently by regulating the pending difficulties through briefs? Calmer days could be awaited for starting a negotiation. The Pope's idea was wise; but Bonaparte, impatient to level the obstacles confronting him, wished to go ahead. Negotiations, in which Consalvi and Caprara took part in the name of the Pope, Bernier and Cacault in the name of the French government, were carried on amid difficulties without number, and finally led to the writing of the concordat which was signed at Paris (September 16, 1803) and ratified (November 2) by Napoleon Bonaparte, acting as president of the Italian Republic. This concordat, drawn up in the same spirit as the French concordat, was officially published at Milan on January 26, 1804. Unfortunately it was accompanied by a decree, signed by Melzi, which once again, for the pretended purpose of assuring the execution of the law, violated several most important articles of it. Decidedly the bad will of the Italian government did not recoil before any hypocrisy. Napoleon tried to calm the Pope's alarms by a letter (April 24, 1804), professing that henceforth his protection would be more effective. The first consul was thinking of the empire, of the consecration he was going to receive, and undoubtedly also of the iron crown of the kings of Italy that he was going to assume the next year. But, on the contrary, the situation grew worse than ever. The Gallican maxims would, in 1810, be declared for all Italy the laws of the empire, and the recalcitrant bishops would be imprisoned by order of the new emperor.

---

[88] Theiner, *op. cit.*, II, 10.

[89] For the complete text of these organic laws, see Theiner, *op. cit.*, II, 10–14.

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

The Church of Spain was destined to share the lot of that of Italy. But it had passed through different phases. Up to the proclamation of the empire, the Iberian states did not have to undergo the invasion of the French armies. In Spain, the minister Godoy was the ally of Bonaparte; in Portgual, the regent, from 1801 to 1803, had purchased peace with France at the price of repeated subsidies. But, to remain under a constitution of the old regime, the states of the Iberian peninsula were not exempt from a secret spirit of hostility toward Rome.

On October 9, 1801, Vargas, the Spanish minister in Rome, informed Cardinal Consalvi of several claims formulated by his sovereign, Charles IV. He required that the papal nuncio should have no jurisdiction at Madrid. In a diplomatic note, he said: "The king of Spain knows that those who in his states are ecclesiastics are nonetheless his subjects." [91] The Madrid court formulated other claims.

> Attempts were made to put the regulars under the domination of the bishops and to withdraw them from the authority of their general superiors. The government strove to accredit the bishops with faculties for all matrimonial dispensations and desired to monopolize the collation of all the benefices and other considerably extended powers. The court of Madrid demanded the right to confer at will the ecclesiastical goods and even to confiscate several of these properties, to the evident prejudice of the clergy. In short, it demanded at one and the same time so many things and so important things that no one could credit these claims if they were here enumerated.[92]

By his prudent condescensions, the Cardinal was able to smooth out these difficulties. Cardinal de Bourbon was appointed visitator of all the religious orders of the realm; a concordat was concluded with Charles IV, to whom subsidies were granted in view of the war against the English.

Scarcely were the difficulties on the part of Spain settled, when Portugal stirred up new ones.

> The court of Portugal published an edict that wounded the rights of the Holy See and several canon laws. The Holy Father, who was then in France, where he had gone to consecrate Napoleon, wrote

---

[91] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Pie VII,* I, 207.

[92] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* II, 278.

> from Paris to the prince regent of Portugal; but, owing to the ruses of the Lisbon cabinet, this effort had little success. Perhaps we would have reached a favorable conciliation if the affairs of France had not then absorbed the care of the Pope and his minister.[93]

This concern for the affairs of France likewise delayed the solution of the religious affairs of Germany. Catholic Germany which, like Italy, had been invaded by the armies of the Revolution, and, more than Spain and Portugal, imbued with the anti-Roman ideas that had been propagated there by Febronius and Joseph II, was perhaps, after France, the country most deeply disturbed, the country where the need of religious peace was most deeply felt. News of the conclusion of the French concordat produced an immense sensation there.

> In no country was this concordat more admired than in Germany. It revived the hopes of the Catholics. With what joy they thus saw shortened the days of their griefs and the inalienable rights restored to the Church! This concordat was greeted as a happy presage of a delivery soon. The Catholic rulers, as well as the Protestant, soon saw themselves obliged to guarantee by special concordats the rights of the Church which triumphant impiety on one hand and secular intolerance on the other had so stubbornly contested and cast under foot.[94]

These tendencies reached their full realization only after the reestablishment of the empire. Unfortunately the German princes found in Napoleon's conduct a precedent that permitted them to retain several of the ancient abuses; for Napoleon had done two things which he presented as complementary and inseparable: the concordat and the organic articles. The concordat did indeed pay homage to religion, but the organic articles were a sort of trick. The German sovereigns "traced almost servilely the lines of their ecclesiastical policy upon those of Napoleon. They demanded and obtained from Rome that a structure be

[93] *Ibid.*, II, 282.

[94] Theiner, *Histoire des deux Concordats,* I, 297.

given to their Churches; then they proceeded to regulate without restraint the detail of those structures, even though the structure itself would have to suffer thereby." [95]

Protestantism in France

The French concordat of 1801 did more than influence the organization of the national Churches in the other Catholic states; it was the starting point of a policy of Napoleon's understanding with the other religious faiths.

The Protestants were rather numerous and influential in France in the reign of Louis XVI but they became more so in the course of the Revolution, thanks to the backing brought to them by the conquests of French armies. Under the Directory, Madame de Staël went so far as to advise the public authorities to adopt Protestantism as the state religion.[96] The proposal was not judged practicable, but "most of the men in high places extended to the Reformed religion a benevolence made up of the desire to make a show of tolerance and to plague the Catholics." [97] Under the Consulate, the Council of State, in a memorial presented to the consuls (January, 1802), thus expressed their mind: "The government, while declaring that Catholicism is the religion of the majority in France, did not intend to exclude the Protestant worship from its protection. Protestantism is a Christian communion, which has a right to protection. Its founders were the first to spread in Europe liberal maxims of government." [98] We are not surprised to see the first consul present to the legislative body, at the same time as the organic articles of Catholic worship, the organic articles of Protestant worship. This organic law of April 7, 1802, is divided into three titles, and regulates the situation, not of all the Protestant faiths, but of two only, that of the Reformed Churches (Calvinist), and that of the Churches of the Augsburg Confession (Lutheran). Title I contains general dispositions for all the Protestant communities. Napoleon's political considerations and a certain distrust of the Protestant cosmopolitanism are revealed in the following articles: in article 1, declaring that "no one can exercise the functions of public worship unless he is French; in article 2, enacting that neither "the Protestant Churches nor their ministers can have dealings with any foreign power or authority"; in articles 4 and 5, saying that "no doctrinal decision and no disciplinary change can take place without the authorization of the government." In return, by virtue of article 6, the pastors will receive support from the state.

---

[95] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* I, 140.

[96] See the memoir published by Paul Gautier in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (November 1, 1899).

[97] L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* I, 336.

[98] Quoted by G. de Felice, *Histoire des protestants de France,* p. 602.

Title II is concerned with the Calvinist worship and institutes for it pastors, consistories, and synods. The pastors will be elected by the consistories and will be confirmed by the government. The consistories will be composed of the pastors administering a district of 6,000 souls, and from 6 to 12 laymen. The synods will be composed of the pastors of five consistorial churches. They shall meet in accordance with the authorization of the government, to which they shall submit their decisions.

Title III concerns the Lutheran religion. Its organization is analogous to that of the Calvinist religion, but somewhat more complicated. It embraces pastors, local consistories, inspectors, and general consistories.

In short, the two Protestant religions found themselves placed, by the law of 18 Germinal, in a condition of rather strict dependence on the state. But neither the pastors nor the faithful complained. "They were less sensible of the sacrifice of part of their religious independence than of the advantages which they promised themselves from the payments by the state; for they found therein two major advantages: an undeniable legal recognition, and the official guaranty of a perfect equality with the Roman Catholics." [99] Rabaut-Dupuy, who was president of the Legislative Body in 1802, later, in a circular addressed to the members of the Reformed Churches of the Empire, said: "You who lived under the yoke of intolerance, look and compare. No longer in the deserts will you pay homage to the Creator, your temples are restored to you, your pastors are recognized public functionaries and are paid salaries by the government." [100]

Later, many Protestants, including some of the most prominent of them, did not hide their dissatisfaction with a law that, as they said, utterly deformed the primitive organization of Calvinist Presbyterianism. Instead of a religious society existing in itself and by itself, appointing its ministers, passing judgment on differences, and deciding all doctrinal or disciplinary questions in independent conferences, the Germinal law instituted a civil society dependent in everything on the secular power, resting its existence on a power alien to the very basis of Presbyterianism. From the Protestant point of view, that was the first evil of the new organization. Its second defect was the absolute suppression of the prime element of Protestantism, the individual Church, with its consistory and its pastor, and instead founding it in a consistorial Church, made up of assembled pastors.[101] But, once again, all this unfitness passed unperceived or was regarded as largely compensated by the advantages of an official recognition of the Protestant Churches and by the assured support of their pastors. The president of the Geneva consistory became the spokesman of all the ministers and of all the Protestants by officially addressing his thanks to Napoleon.[102]

---

[99] G. de Felice, *op. cit.*, p. 604.

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 605.

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 607. Cf. Vinet, *Essai sur la manifestation des convictions religieuses*, p. 387; F. Puaux, *Histoire populaire des protestants français*, p. 361.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 610.

The first consul intended to regulate in a like manner the situation of the Jews. But in 1802 the memory of certain speculations engaged in by the Jews on the national possessions was still too vivid in the minds of the people. Napoleon thought that a law which would make the scattered Jews in France a more compact and more independent body, was a premature undertaking. The official organization of the Jewish religion was not regulated until six years later.

Meanwhile the Jews, who in large numbers had joined Freemasonry, found some compensation in the favor shown to that society. At a feast (April 10, 1801) which brought together more than 500 masons at the Grand Orient, Freemasonry acclaimed Bonaparte.[103] By Cambacérès and Dubois, already initiated, it had in the consular government powerful protectors. The first consul replied to the advances of the society. We have no proofs that he had been initiated; but the annals of Masonry relate, under date of September, 1802, the naming of General Murat, who was governor of Paris, as first guardian,[104] and, under date of December 18, 1803, the raising of General Massena to the rank of grand ruler.[105] The year 1804 became one of the most important dates in the history of Masonry by the merging of the Grand Orient with the general Grand Lodge. The agreement that consecrated this fusion is known by Masons under the name of the Concordat of 1804. As related by one who is almost an official historian of Masonry, "it was signed on December 3, 1804, in the house of Marshal Kellermann."[106] When the Empire was proclaimed, "Masonry," says Bazot, then secretary of the Grand Orient, "counted almost 1,200 lodges. At Paris, in the departments, in the colonies, in the reunited countries, and in the armies, the highest public officials, marshals, generals, magistrates, scholars, commerce, industry, nearly all France in its prominent men, fraternized in Masonic fashion with the Masons who were simple citizens." [107] These enthusiastic lines undoubtedly contain an exaggeration; but what seems likely is that Bonaparte, clever in seizing to his own profit all the political and social powers, tried to make use of Freemasonry for the realization of his grand projects. The eminent historian, Frederick Schlegel, who had close relations with the leaders of the rationalist and the Jewish world, wrote: "Can we find anyone who does not know or who has forgotten with what skill the man who in these latter times ruled over the world utilized that vehicle in all the vanquished countries, and used it as an organ suited to mislead and nourish all public opinion with false hopes?" [108]

---

[103] Rebold, *Histoire des trois grandes loges de France,* 1864, p. 79.

[104] *Ibid.,* p. 89.

[105] *Ibid.,* p. 92.

[106] *Ibid.,* p. 94. Rebold's work bears the Imprimatur of the Grand Orient.

Napoleon Proclaimed Emperor

In 1804 public opinion in France and in Europe seemed ready to accept the realization of the vast ambitions of Napoleon Bonaparte. By prodigies of energy he who had surmounted the prejudices of his entourage, the opposition of the constitutional clergy, the trickery of Talleyrand (Minister of Foreign Affairs), and the intrigues of Fouché (Minister of Police), in effecting the Concordat, thought that the head of the Church would not refuse him a testimonial of gratitude for so many efforts and that Pius VII would be willing to give a consecration to the coveted high dignity, which was nothing less than to place the imperial crown on the head of Napoleon Bonaparte. But for this new title of emperor, an extraordinarily solemn consecration was needed. The coronation conferred by a French bishop in the Reims cathedral, such as had been given to the kings of the former monarchy, would not be enough. Napoleon wished a coronation at Notre Dame in Paris, in a ceremony presided over by the pope himself.

---

[107] Bazot, *Code des franc-maçons,* p. 183, quoted by Gautherot under the word "Franc-Maçonnerie" in the *Dictionnaire d'apologétique,* II, 110.

[108] Schlegel, *Philosophie de l'histoire,* French tr., II, 365.

We know how, following a proposal (April 23, 1804) by the tribune Curée, the Senate proclaimed Bonaparte emperor of the French.

Officially informed by a letter of Caprara, dated May 11, 1804, that the Emperor wished to be consecrated by the pope, Pius VII fell into a great dejection.[109] The Holy Father was not unmindful that the first consul, by bringing about the religious pacification, had always sought to strengthen and increase his own power. In having himself crowned emperor by the head of the Church, one of his chief purposes was to remove the strongest supports of Louis XVIII. For the Pope to lend himself to Napoleon's plan was consequently to stir up against himself the royalist party, already decidedly aroused. Perhaps it would also be to lend himself to a new orientation of the political destinies of Europe. At the same time the Pope could easily foresee what would be the consequences of a refusal, opposed to such a man at such a moment.

Pius VII, that he might not bear alone the responsibility for the decision, assembled the Sacred College. Fifteen cardinals out of twenty declared themselves in favor of the Holy Father's journey to Paris, but with reservation of the following four conditions: a promise to reform "some organic articles that exceeded the liberties of the Gallican Church";[110] a full observance of the consecration ceremonies; refusal by the Pope to receive the constitutional bishops who have not adhered to the decisions of His Holiness regarding the ecclesiastical affairs of France; refusal by the Pope to receive Madame Talleyrand, whose marriage His Holiness would never recognize.[111] Bernier, now bishop of Orléans, in a reply made in the name of the first consul, acknowledged "that too many of the maxims of the old parlements had been mingled with our liberties," and that "four constitutional bishops unfortunately had not observed the proprieties of their state"; that this question, as also that of the consecration ceremonial, could best be decided at Paris.[112] In a clever note, Talleyrand gave almost the same guaranties and endeavored especially to imply that the contemplated step by the Pope could not create any grave difficulty for the Holy See. He said:

---

[109] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VII,* II, 93.

[110] *Ibid.*

[111] *Ibid.,* II, 99.

> The journey of His Holiness to France can inspire in the foreign courts no sort of suspicion. France did not hesitate to recognize His Holiness, although his election took place in the states of a foreign sovereign and amid enemies that France had to fight. How would those same powers, today friends or allies of France, look with an evil eye on an event by which the common father of the faithful should honor with his presence this vast and glorious empire restored to religion? . . . His Holiness has nothing to fear from the old parties that for so long a time divided France. Scarcely will he set foot on the soil of France, when he will perceive that these parties no longer exist.[113]

On August 3, 1804,[114] Napoleon himself promised the Holy Father complete satisfaction in the matter of the execution of the Italian concordat.[115] The preliminary conferences continued for more than two months longer. Ever since the preceding year, Napoleon, in view of the negotiations that he was planning and with the purpose of facilitating a conclusion favorable to his desires, sent his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, to Rome as ambassador.

This appointment did not fail to stir up keen feeling in the papal court. They regretted the loss of Cacault, whose devotedness to the Holy See had been evident by eminent services; and the antecedents of Napoleon's uncle were calculated to arouse well-founded misgivings. A priest before the Revolution, Joseph Fesch had, during the Terror, abandoned the priestly career. As partisan of the new ideas, he exercised the functions of commissioner of war, and returned to the Church only after the 18th Brumaire. The favor of his nephew rapidly advanced him to the office of archbishop of Lyons and to the dignity of cardinal. His life, which until then had been rather stormy and was dominated by preoccupations of temporal interest, became regular, and even austere and modest. He reached Rome on July 2, 1803, accompanied by a secretary whose name, already celebrated, would continue to grow, Viscount Chateaubriand. Cardinal Fesch's intelligence was not outstanding, but his activity was extraordinary and notably contributed to the success of the diplomatic mission entrusted to him.[116]

---

[112] For Bernier's letter, see Artaud, II, 105.

[113] See this note in Artaud, II, 109–11.

[114] Here for the first time Napoleon did not make use of the Republican calendar.

[115] Artaud, II, 113.

On October 29 the Pope again assembled the Sacred College and announced to it that, positively knowing the Emperor's firm determination to protect the Church more and more, he would, for the good of religion, undertake the long journey to Paris. Consalvi, his Secretary of State, would have full powers during his absence, to regulate the spiritual and temporal affairs.

Pius VII left Rome on November 2, crossed through Italy and France amid the heartiest testimonials of respect and affection. He was the object of particularly touching manifestations at Lyons. All heads bowed religiously to receive the blessing of the holy Pontiff, whose noble bearing, thin features, slightly bowed head, affable smile, and deep-set eyes breathed an air of religious majesty and fatherly kindness.[117]

---

[116] Lyonnet, *Le cardinal Fesch,* 1841; Gattet, *La verité sur le cardinal Fesch,* 1842.

[117] The *Annales religieuses* of Orleans (March 20, 1898) contains a report by an eyewitness on the occasion of Pius VII's passing through Montargis. This account contains a detailed description of the Holy Father's appearance. In reply to Fouché,

The Coronation

Everyone is acquainted with the grandiose scenes of December 2, 1804; its chief act has been popularized by David's celebrated picture. All the bells of the city and the great bell of Notre Dame pealed their mightiest; in the old cathedral, adorned with purple draperies having golden bees here and there on them, the hero advanced under a canopy, with scepter in hand, and his head crowned with the laurel of the Caesars; Napoleon swearing on the Gospel ever to render to the Church and the Roman Pontiffs the honors that are their due; Pius VII, following the traditional rite, anointing the Emperor and the Empress; then, by a sudden violation of the ceremonial, the sovereign crowning himself and Josephine with a bold gesture; the ceremony terminating by triumphal acclamations to the crowned potentate, while imperial music conducted the Pontiff back to the archiepiscopal palace as the procession repeated the *Tu es Petrus.*[118]

The impression left upon the people by this great religious solemnity was not the only beneficial result of the Pope's journey. His coming to Paris was the occasion for the renunciation of their schism by a large number of constitutional priests; Napoleon expressed his gratitude to the Pope by re-establishing and officially recognizing several Catholic institutes and establishments, such as the institute of the Lazarists and that of the Daughters of Charity, the Foreign Mission Seminary, and the seminary of the Holy Ghost. To a long memorial presented by Caprara, the Emperor replied in a note (March 11, 1805), drawn up by Talleyrand, marked by a great moderation and proclaiming important principles. As the note said, Napoleon recognized that, in the interest of religion, Pius VII should be

---

who asked him on his arrival how he had found France, the Pope answered: "Heaven be praised! We have passed through the midst of a people on their knees."

[118] Isabey et Fontaine, *Cérémonies et fêtes du sacre,* 1805.

respected, not simply as head of the Church, "but also as an independent monarch"; the Emperor "places in the very first rank of the deeds that have cast splendor on his life the respect he has shown for the Church of Rome." [119] But these general formulas were not accompanied by any precise engagement relative to the particular requests contained in Caprara's memorial, and more than one procedure of the Emperor left a secret bitterness in the heart of the Sovereign Pontiff when he departed from Paris, April 4, 1805.

The first of these proceedings regarded Napoleon's marriage. The day before the coronation, a visit from Josephine de Beauharnais had moved the Holy Father deeply. The official wife of the Emperor [120] confided to him that she had not been married by a priest. Pius VII received the Empress with kindness, but declared to her that, following the laws of the Church, he could not proceed to the ceremony of the consecration until the Emperor should regularize the situation. Napoleon, though angry when he learned of the step taken by Josephine and the Pope's resolution, but promptly understanding how unshakable that resolution was, yielded. Cardinal Fesch, grand chamberlain of the imperial house, being informed of the decision, asked of the Pope the necessary powers and dispensations, and obtained them all to celebrate the marriage in the abnormal conditions that presented themselves. The marriage was performed on December 1 about four o'clock in the afternoon, before Fesch, without witnesses and without the presence of the proper pastor. Napoleon, who was already thinking of a divorce, believed that the lack of these formalities would some day allow the canonical rupture of his marriage. To Fesch he remarked the absence of the witnesses, but the Cardinal disregarded the difficulty and blessed the marriage of December 1, 1804, which is generally regarded as a marriage canonically regular.[121]

---

[119] For further details, see Theiner, *Histoire des deux concordats,* II, 231–87, and Houssonville, *L'église romaine et le premier empire,* I, 319–54.

[120] Josephine Tascher de la Pagerie, born at Martinique in 1763, had married in 1779 the Viscount de Beauharnais, who died on the scaffold in 1794; then in 1796 she married General Bonaparte.

Humiliations of the Pope

The Pontiff was likewise afflicted by other incidents, which Consalvi recalls in his *Mémoires* with scarcely restrained feeling. Writes the Secretary of State:

> I will not speak of all the Pope had to suffer. I will refrain from relating how and why, on the day of the consecration, Napoleon made His Holiness wait an hour and a half; how the ceremony took place so differently from what had been agreed upon; how the Emperor crowned himself, after rudely seizing the crown on the altar before the Pope put out his hand to take it. I will not speak of the way Bonaparte, on all occasions when he appeared in public with the Pope, took a place at his right, and the lack of respect with which he treated him. . . . I enumerate these sufferings that you may grasp to what extent the Pope needed strength, moderation, and kindness to follow, in his humiliations, Him whose vicar he was on earth.[122]

The Pontiff was the object of ovations as he passed again through France and Italy. But these were not sufficient to dissipate the sadness of his soul. He soon learned that certain Catholics of Vienna, of Naples, and of other places were accusing him of weakness, of prevarication, and of apostasy for the step that had cost him so many painful anxieties and so many deceptions.[123] He did not regret what he had done. "The venerable Pontiff, in coming to consecrate the Emperor, had shown to the French how lofty and touching was the majesty of a pope. He had proved his desire to conciliate everyone in order to favor the new rise of religion in France." [124] With Napoleon he left these grave words: "You have made us conceive a great hope; we confidently expect that you will fulfill that hope as emperor of the French." [125] But the Emperor, blinded by so many triumphs, did not heed these wise counsels; and the re-establishment of the empire was but the prelude of a new strife between the priesthood and the empire.

---

[121] Such is the solid conclusion of Welschinger in his work, *Le divorce de Napoléon,* 1889. However, Lecoy de La Marche, in a study published in the *Univers* (May 7, 1889) and reproduced in his *La guerre aux erreurs historiques* (pp. 322–45), strongly opposes this opinion. According to him, "the religious marriage of Napoleon and Josephine, celebrated on December 1, 1804, was simply a comedy." "If later on it was ruptured in a fashion not altogether regular, reasons enough were present for the annulment." These reasons were: the lack of witnesses, a defect poorly covered by the general concession of the powers given to Cardinal Fesch, and especially the defect of consent by Napoleon, who did not wish at any price to marry Josephine, and who agreed to the ceremony only because it was laid down as a condition for the consecration, and who, by requiring and expressly noting the absence of witnesses, indicated his desire to bring about canonical causes for the annulment of this fictitious marriage.

[122] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* II, 403.

---

[123] See the sadly famous letter of Joseph de Maistre. "Here people make fun of the simple fellow. . . . The offenses of an Alexander Borgia are less revolting than this hideous apostasy. . . . With all my heart I should wish that the unfortunate Pontiff went to Santo Domingo to consecrate Dessalines." J. de Maistre, *Correspondance,* I, 138.

[124] Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'Empereur,* 1905, p. 45.

[125] Letter of August 2, 1804. For the entire text of the letter, see Theiner, *op. cit.,* II, 288.

CHAPTER IX

The Church and the Empire (1804–1814)

THE historian of Pius VII, Artaud de Montor, whose judgments deserve particular attention because he was, as a diplomat, involved in most of the events that he relates, thus evaluates the character of Napoleon:

> In him, when he was treating of religious matters, were to be found two distinct men: first, a spirit that was exact, prompt, affable, clear, ready to ask advice on questions with which he was not well informed, receiving useful guidance with good grace; then, a restless spirit, possessed by a foolish vanity, with uncertain learning, envious of the mission of the priests, and considering himself humiliated by the fact that, in his leisure intervals between battles, the emperor was not the pontiff of the nation, as he was the supreme regulator of the operations of the army.

In the course of the negotiations preparatory to the concordat, he was heard to say, with a touch of humor: "The priests wish to take the souls and to leave me the corpses." At news of the ovations given Pius VII during his journey through France, Napoleon exclaimed bitterly: "They would walk a league to see me, but they would walk twenty to be blessed by the pope." The splendors of the consecration and the coronation did but exalt that jealous ambition.

Napoleon's Project

Directly after the ceremony at Notre Dame the Emperor seems to have conceived the project of keeping the pope in France. The thought of Philip the Fair exercising a haughty watchfulness over the pope of Avignon seemingly haunted the Emperor's mind.

> The Pope never would divulge who was the high officer that one day spoke to him of living at Avignon, or of accepting a papal palace in Paris. . . . The diplomatic corps at Rome were speaking of such rumors; these were so confidently repeated that the Pope judged he ought to make a reply to the same high official: "A report has been spread that we can be kept in France. Very well, suppose they take away our liberty; all this has been provided for. Before leaving Rome we signed a regular abdication, available. . . . When they have signed the plans which they meditate, you will have left in your hands only a miserable monk, who will call himself Barnabas Chiaramonti." [1]

This energetic reply brought an end to all the rumors. If, as Artaud hints, Napoleon intended to feel out the ground by allowing these reports to circulate, the experiment had been made; the imperial dream had to be abandoned.

The first note of the disagreement that would soon grow worse in such a tragic way between the Pope and the Emperor broke out in connection with the Italian affairs. On May 26, 1805, Napoleon crowned himself at Milan as king of Italy. Seizing the iron crown of the Lombard kings, he forcefully repeated the famous formula: "God gives it to me; let anyone who touches it beware!" A few days later (June 8) he reorganized the regular and secular clergy of Italy, re-established numerous congregations, and restored the former revenues to the bishops, the seminaries, and the fabrics.[2] The people and clergy of Milan at first greeted this act with their enthusiastic acclamations and declared Napoleon the restorer of the Church of Italy.

But Pius VII took a different view of the decree of June 8 and pointed out in it two serious encroachments on the rights of the Church: (1) this decree, issued simply by Napoleon's own authority, openly violated article 20 of the Concordat, according to which all dispositions to be taken regarding the affairs of the Church must be previously concerted between the Holy See and the president of the Italian Republic; (2) the decree embraced, along with several favorable dispositions, certain harmful measures, such as the introduction of the Napoleonic Code in Italy, thus authorizing divorce. These observations were the subject of a brief (July 11) to which Napoleon replied (August 19) in a rather sharp tone: "As I have said more than once to Your Holiness, the court of Rome is following a policy which, good in different times, is no longer adapted to the age in which we are living." [3] The closing lines of the letter, however, were milder. "I will lend my cooperation in all possible modifications," said the Emperor. Pius VII therefore did not despair of reaching an understanding and took under consideration the choosing of negotiators instructed to confer on the matter with Cardinal Fesch, the Emperor's plenipotentiary. But a new affair soon arose, which would accentuate the disagreement between Napoleon and the Holy See.

---

[1] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VII,* II, 194.

[2] See the text of the decree in the *Bolletino delle leggi del regno d'Italia,* pp. 123–40. A summary of it will be found in Theiner, *Histoire des deux concordats,* II, 338–43.

The Marriage of Jerome Bonaparte

A brother of Napoleon, Jerome Bonaparte, the future king of Westphalia, had contracted at Baltimore (December 24, 1803) a regular marriage with Miss Patterson. But for this purpose he had asked the consent neither of his mother nor of his brother, Napoleon. The latter, with insistence and a menacing tone, called upon the Pope to declare, by a bull, the nullity of this marriage. Jerome, he said, was a minor, he had failed to get the consent of his mother, he had married a heretic, and the marriage took place without the presence of his pastor: for these three reasons the validity of the marriage could not be admitted. The Emperor added: "I could easily have this matrimonial bond annuled in Paris, as the Gallican Church regards these marriages as null. It seemed to me better that this be done at Rome, if only for the example of sovereign houses that might contract marriage with a Protestant."

---

[3] *Correspondance de Napoléon,* XI, 119.

The reason for such insistence can be explained only by the desire, with the complicity of the Holy See, to create another rupture of the conjugal bond. Ever since his coming to the imperial power, Napoleon seemed to be obsessed by the thought of breaking his own marriage with Josephine de Beauharnais. A papal bull, giving to the dissolution of Jerome's marriage a universal reverberation, would accustom the people to these annulments of lawful marriages, which public opinion was disposed to look upon in an unfavorable light.

But Pius VII, as always, on this occasion consulted in the first place the law of the Church. But according to this law (1) the lack of the parents' consent is not a diriment impediment; (2) though unions contracted with heretics are illicit, they are not consequently null; and (3) the absence of the proper pastor is an absolute impediment to the marriage only in places where the Council of Trent has been promulgated, but that council was not promulgated in Baltimore. The Pope then concludes in favor of the validity of the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte with Elizabeth Patterson and of the impossibility of dissolving it canonically.

The Emperor's unbounded wrath was expressed in terms as unworthy of a sovereign as of any son of the Church. "The Pope," he wrote to Cardinal Fesch (January 7, 1806), "has sent me a most ridiculous and senseless letter. . . . My intention is to recall you and replace you by a layman. Since these imbeciles do not find any unfitness in having a Protestant occupy the throne of France, I will send them a Protestant ambassador." [4] These threats did not scare Pius VII. On January

---

[4] For this letter, see *Correspondance de Napoléon,* XI, 643.

29 he wrote as follows to the Emperor: "If the state of tribulation for which God has reserved us should reach its height, if we are to see ourselves despoiled of the friendship and benevolence of Your Majesty, the priest of Jesus Christ, who has the truth in his heart and on his lips, will support all with resignation and without fear." [5]

Evidently these last lines of the Pope's letter produced a lively impression on Napoleon.[6] But in these early days of 1806, following the great battle of Austerlitz and the treaty of Pressburg, Napoleon, intoxicated with his triumphs, had opened his soul to an unmeasured ambition. To dictate to Austria the harshest terms of peace, to suppress the Bourbons of Naples, to bring to his feet the German princes as so many vassals, to deal out principalities to his generals and crowns to his brothers, all these undertakings were not enough for him who henceforth believed himself greater than Charlemagne, mightier than the mighty emperors of the past. After fifteen days of silence, he replied to the Pope thus: "Your Holiness is sovereign of Rome, but I am its emperor. . . . Answerable to God are those who use so much zeal in protecting Protestant marriages, those who delay the expedition of the bulls of my bishops and who turn my dioceses over to anarchy." [7] On October 6, 1806, The Emperor obtained from the compliance of his diocesan court the annulment of his brother's marriage. By virtue of this decision King Jerome married (August 22, 1807) a Protestant princess, the daughter of the King of Würtemberg; and the Emperor had the effrontery to send word of it to Pius VII by an official letter. The Pope replied: "We hope that new and just motives, with which we have not been made acquainted, were presented. . . . This hope sustains us in the bitterness and forboding which we cannot shake off."

---

[5] Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 257.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Letter of February 13, 1806. See *ibid.*, pp. 258–63.

Conflict between Napoleon and the Pope

The affair of Jerome's marriage was a mere incident of the great quarrel. Napoleon's claim or assertion, in his letter of February 13, over the government of Rome, had a general bearing which the head of the Church could not let pass without protest.

On March 21, 1806, after consulting the cardinals, Pius VII wrote to the Emperor: "Your Majesty asserts on principle that you are the emperor of Rome. With apostolic frankness we reply that the Sovereign Pontiff, sovereign of Rome, does not recognize and never has recognized in his states a power superior to his own. You are immensely renowned, but you have been chosen, consecrated, crowned, recognized as emperor of the French and not of Rome." [8] One historian remarks: "Let us note well that, at the moment when the peoples, princes, and kings bow before the dominating authority of Napoleon, only an aged pontiff, without resources and without backing, dares to confront that all-powerful and proud despot." [9]

But the Emperor had already passed from words to acts. The year before, under pretext of measures necessitated by his war against Austria, he ordered Gouvion-Saint-Cyr to seize Ancona. On the very day of his famous letter to the Pope, he wrote to Fesch: "No Swedish, English, or Russian vessels must enter a port of the Papal States, otherwise I will have them confiscated." Two months later (April 18) Cardinal Fesch was abruptly recalled, being replaced as ambassador by the regicide Alquier. The Emperor ordered Civitavecchia to be occupied and had the *Moniteur* announce that he disposed of the principality of Beneventum in favor of Talleyrand, and the principality of Pontecorvo in favor of Bernadotte. These were two principalities of the papal territory.

[8] Letter dated February 13, 1806. *Ibid.*, p. 270.

[9] H. Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'Empereur*, p. 56.

Cardinal Fesch's last mission had been to demand from the Pope the recognition of Joseph Bonaparte as king of Naples. One of Alquier's first missions was to require the Holy Father to dismiss Cardinal Consalvi, whose knowledge and skill might be an obstacle to the Emperor's designs. Pius VII, in a spirit of peace, decided to sacrifice Consalvi, whom he replaced by a man of austere virtue, the venerable Cardinal Casoni, an old man of seventy-four, one-time vice-legate of Avignon and formerly nuncio to the court of Madrid. But the Pope declared that he could not recognize Joseph Bonaparte as king of Naples, a man who had violently invaded the states of Ferdinand VII. A fulminating note arrived from Paris, enjoining the Pope to recognize Prince Joseph without delay, under pain of seeing the Emperor cease to admit the papal sovereignty.

But the Pope was not to be frightened by any threat. To Alquier he said: "We are disposed to do everything possible for the future good relations and concord, provided the integrity of the principles is maintained. . . . This decision is a matter of our conscience. . . . Above all monarchs reigns a God who is the avenger of justice." Alquier wrote to Talleyrand: "People are strangely mistaken about the character of this sovereign if they suppose that his apparent condescension yields to every movement that is attempted to impress him." Napoleon failed to grasp the sincerity of so righteous a resistance. He thought that Pius VII was subject to the influence of certain cardinals, and the Emperor believed he would get the better of him by terror. He wrote: "I will set up at Rome a king or a senator. I will cut up his states into several duchies." After the decisive success of Friedland (Pravdinsk) and after the peace of Tilsit, Napoleon decided to put his plan into execution.

The Holy Roman Empire

We have now reached the year 1807. A year earlier an event of grave importance took place, which was of a nature to give Napoleon's authority a new brilliance and a new power. On August 6, 1806, Emperor Francis II had renounced his title of head of the Germanic Empire.[10] His act seemed to lack spontaneity. The new Augustulus, as has been said, merely foretold a new Odoacer. However this may be, the event was serious.

> It was the crown of Augustus, of Constantine, of Charles, and of Maximilian that Francis of Hapsburg laid down, and a new era in the world's history was marked by the fall of its most venerable instituton. One thousand and six years after Pope Leo had crowned the Frankish king, eighteen hundred and fifty-eight years after Caesar had conquered at Pharsalia, the Holy Roman Empire came to its end.[11]

Up to that time, although the papacy had not, for a long time past, received any effective help from the Holy Empire, nevertheless toward it the pope had turned in moments of distress. Francis II was the one who, as Germanic Emperor,[12] had taken the conclave of Venice under his protection. With this great institution in ruins, Napoleon no longer saw any limits to his pretention to take in hand the scepter of Charlemagne.

On this ground he had already increased his interference in the religious domain. At first came countless benefactions. The goods of the fabrics that had not been sold were restored to them; the support of 30,000 chapels was assured; 24,000 burses were granted to the diocesan seminaries. The congregations of the Foreign Missions, of St. Lazare, and of the Holy Ghost were re-established.[13] The priests of St. Sulpice were reorganized under the direction of Father Emery and took possession of many diocesan seminaries with the benevolent backing of Cardinal Fesch.[14] The Christian Brothers had obtained authorization to resume their religious garb.[15] The Emperor consented to the re-establishment of the Trappists, who had founded two houses at the very gates of Paris.[16] By these measures Napoleon affirmed the claim to take up the protective work of Charlemagne. But notable was the difference between the proceedings of Charlemagne and those of the new Emperor of the French; [17] and the Catholics could not for a long time be under any illusion on the matter. After authorizing the three congregations of the Foreign Missions, St. Lazare, and the Holy Ghost, Napoleon abrogated to himself the right to merge them into one, to be directed by a council with Cardinal Fesch at its head.[18] Napoleon combined all the religious periodicals into one, which he called *Le journal des curés*.[19] He instituted two new feasts: St. Napoleon (from St. Neapolysus, martyr under Diocletian), which he fixed for August 15, and the feast of the coronation, which he put on the Sunday following the day which corresponded to 11 Frimaire.[20] He undertook to impose his wishes on the archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Belloy, a feeble and venerable old man, who was utterly devoted to him; [21] Napoleon interfered by criticism of such and such pastoral letters, such and such sermons.[22] A priest was denounced to Napoleon for having made, in the pulpit or merely in conversation, an inconsiderate remark, or for having expressed some "ultramontane" doctrine; the Emperor had the priest arrested and, without investigation, had him put in a monastery or imprisoned. The dungeon of Vincennes, the prisons of Fenestrelle, Ivrée, and Ile Sainte-Marguerite received priests who were never able to surmise the reason for their arrest.[23] Lastly he ordered the printing of a catechism in which the text declared that every Christian "owed to Napoleon I love, respect, obedience, fidelity, and military service."[24]

---

[10] *Histoire des traités,* Vol. VIII. *Corpus juris confoederationis germanicae,* I, 70.

[11] James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire,* p. 359.

[12] After the abdication of August 6, 1806, Francis II remained emperor of Austria and took the name of Francis I.

[13] A. Launay, *Histoire générale de la Société des Missions étrangères,* III, 420.

---

[14] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* II, 173–75.

[15] J. Guibert, *Histoire de saint J.-B. de la Salle,* p. 646. In the decree of November 17, which created the imperial university, the Brothers were incorporated in the university. Guibert, *ibid.*

[16] Picot, *Mémoires,* the year 1807.

[17] Cf. Artaud, *op. cit.,* II, 258–62.

[18] A. Launay, *op. cit.,* III, 420–22. "This decree was not carried out. The three congregations remained in their condition unchanged. This state of affairs could scarcely be otherwise, for they were composed merely of a few scattered members; a merger would simply have pooled their wretchedness."

[19] Haussonville, *L' Eglise romaine et le premier empire,* II, 229.

[20] *Ibid.,* pp. 230–34.

[21] On Cardinal de Belloy, see Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* IV, 1.

[22] *Ibid.,* pp. 222–27.

Such encroachments and the growing ambition of Napoleon were not of a sort to reassure the Supreme Pontiff. At the beginning of 1807, he wrote: "We are still pontiff, free perhaps for a few months. Who knows but new victories in northern Europe will not be the signal of our ruin? Let us hasten to the celebration of a feast in which the tiara which an ungrateful son has given us may be able still to rest on our head."[25] Pius VII was referring to a canonization. In the preceding forty years, Rome had not seen a ceremony of this sort. Neither Clement XIV nor Pius VI had proclaimed a canonization, one of the most imposing ceremonies that a pope can celebrate. On May 24, 1807, in the Vatican Basilica, illuminated by thousands of sconces and ornamented by the banners of the new saints, Pius VII, surrounded by the cardinals and a brilliant procession, ordered to be inscribed in the number of the saints a humble young woman, reformer of the Franciscans, St. Collette; a poor Sicilian shepherd, St. Benedict the Moor; the foundress of a religious order, St. Angela Merici; a simple nun, St. Hyacinth Marescotti; and lastly a pious and charitable priest, St. Francis Caracciolo. The French ambassador, Alquier, in a diplomatic note, relates that "the canonization of five blessed servants of God had attracted a prodigious throng . . . and that people came from the depths of Bohemia and Hungary."[26] The former member of the Convention might well compare the spectacles he had witnessed at Paris with those he viewed at Rome. Before the ashes of the "great men" to whom the Revolution had dedicated its Pantheon, crowds of men had filed past, guided by banal curiosity or by a cold admiration; at the feet of the new saints whom the Church was placing on her altars, the Christian people went to their knees in veneration and love, as to the feet of so many brethren, friends, and good and powerful protectors to whom they could henceforth confidently turn with supplication and whom they could regard as models. On the morrow of the great storms just passed through, and on the eve of those that could still be feared, the majestic liturgical solemnity of May 24, 1807, was a supernatural solace for the Pope and for the Church.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 227; Lanzac de Laborie, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 248. Apart from the political passages that Napoleon inserted, the imperial catechism had a real value. The commission which drew it up took as a basis the catechism of Meaux, composed by Bossuet, whose words were kept verbatim as far as possible. On the writing of this catechism, see Haussonville, *op. cit.*, pp. 236–72.

[25] Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

New Threats

These new storms were not long delayed. On July 22, 1807, concerning a refusal, given by Casoni in the Pope's name, to institute bishops in Italy so long as the Emperor should violate the ecclesiastical immunities, Napoleon wrote to the viceroy of Italy: "Perhaps the time is not far off when I will recognize the pope merely as bishop of Rome. . . . Let all know: for the court of Rome I shall always be Charlemagne and never Louis the Pious."[27] In August, Talleyrand was unexpectedly replaced in the foreign affairs office by Count de Champagny. What mystery was hidden under this little cabinet revolution? Did Talleyrand withdraw of his own accord, with the hope of still directing foreign affairs through a subordinate in his place? Or, on the contrary, did this change indicate a new direction of the imperial policy?[28] Shortly afterward, a report spread that Napoleon intended to go to Rome. What was the purpose of this journey? The Holy Father judged that a favorable interpretation of the project was more charitable as well as more prudent. To the Emperor he offered the hospitality of the Vatican.

---

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

Napoleon's only reply was an order to General Lemarois that he should seize the duchy of Urbino, the province of Macerata, Fermo and Spoleto, and to keep Cardinal Bayane at Milan until Prince Eugene learned from him whether he had the necessary powers to settle the differences between Rome and Paris. The Pope must march in step with the French scheme; otherwise the Emperor would appeal the question to a general council, "the sole infallible organ and supreme arbiter of all religious disputes."[29]

After such threats, the Pope, with his territory violated and his cities seized, could not repeat his conciliatory proposals. The situation was open war against the Holy See. Pius VII, instead of confirming the powers already given to Cardinal Bayane to treat with Napoleon, suspended them and ordered the cardinal to return to Rome.

From that moment the Emperor no longer restrained his anger. He instructed Prince Eugene (January 10, 1808) to direct on Rome General Miollis at the head of a brigade. On February 2 the French troops, entering the city by the Porta del Popolo, disarmed the guard, occupied the Castle Sant' Angelo, and, while the Pope and the Sacred College were celebrating the solemn function of the Purification in the Quirinal chapel, a body of cavalry and infantry was stationed in the big square of the papal palace. Ten pieces of artillery were set up facing the windows of the Pope's apartment.[30] In a vigorous note, Pius VII declared that, as long as Rome should be invaded, he refused to engage in any sort of negotiation, and he ordered the papal representative at Paris, Cardinal Caprara, to ask for his passports.

---

[28] Welschinger, "Jugement de Villemain sur le prince de Talleyrand," in *Nouvelle revue,* November 15, 1894.

[29] Welschinger, *op. cit.,* p. 65.

General Miollis distributed his forces in the different sections of Rome and, by order of his government, began that series of outrages which, as Pacca says, "would hardly be believed by anyone who had not been a witness of them." At the end of February the Neapolitan cardinals received orders to leave for Naples within twenty-four hours. The papal troops were obliged to be incorporated in the French forces; the officers who resisted were arrested and were led off to the fortresses. On March 27 Cardinal Doria, who, with the title of pro-Secretary of State, had replaced Cardinal Casoni, was hauled off from Rome by force. On April 22 Monsignor Cavalchini, governor of Rome, was seized by a detachment of soldiers and was taken to the fortress of Fenestrella. At the same time word of the imperial decree of April 22 reached Rome. By this decree Napoleon, "considering that the sovereign of Rome has continually refused to make war on the English and that the donation of Charlemagne was made for the good of Christianity and not for the benefit of the enemies of our holy religion, joined to his kingdom of Italy the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camerino." [31]

Such a reason could not fool anyone. That the Emperor's actual concern was to isolate England from the rest of the world, was known to all. Having no hope of conquering her on her island, he decreed against her (November 21, 1806) that famous continental blockade by which all commerce with England was forbidden, and he was irritated that the Pope would not, by his religious authority, give his backing to this war measure against a Protestant state. Let Miollis increase the avenging sanctions. He obeyed. On June 16, 1808, the armed force penetrated the papal palace and, near the Pope's apartment, arrested Cardinal Gabrielli, who since March 27 had replaced Cardinal Doria as pro-Secretary of State; Doria had been expelled from Rome as being a Genoese. Only one last outrage remained to be perpetrated.

---

[30] Pacca, *Mémoires* (French trans.), I, 54.

[31] *Correspondance authentique de la cour de Rome*, p. 25.

Pius VII foresaw it; but he maintained his attitude courageously. In the last days of August, Cardinal Pacca, called to take the place of Gabrielli at the Secretariate of State, informed the Pope that an English frigate, sent from Palermo by King Ferdinand of Sicily, was cruising before Fiumicino to take His Holiness to Sicily, should he so desire. Pius VII reflected an instant, then replied: "No, we will not quit the Holy See unless we are taken away by force." [32]

The brutal force was being secretly prepared. Miollis' instructions were that he should act "slowly and without a sudden blow." [33] The General sought to graduate his outrages. On September 6 a Piedmont officer entered Cardinal Pacca's presence and transmitted to him the order that he must leave Rome without delay. The Cardinal declared that he would not leave without the Holy Father's orders. At that very moment the Pope entered the Cardinal's apartment. After a protest, says Pacca, "he took my hand and said to me: 'Cardinal, let us go.' And, through the midst of the papal servants, who applauded him, he returned to his own apartment." [34] The officer hesitated to exercise violence on the person of the Pontiff; but the supreme outrage was merely delayed; a more favorable occasion was awaited to consummate it.

The years 1807 and 1808 were the most critical for the imperial policy. This period was the time when the peoples who were worn out and ruined by the privations which the continental blockade imposed on them, murmured, were restless, and experienced within them an increase of the feeling of their nationalities. Little mysterious associations were formed everywhere against the potentate who closed their ports, disturbed their commerce, drove out their princes, and halted the national life. This period was the time when Spain rose up and started the momentous war which, for six years, held the Emperor's best generals in check. The princes and the oppressed peoples took the side of Spain and were on fire to imitate her. But the Emperor concentrated his troops; and he reinforced them. To the 60,000 conscripts, raised in September, 1808, he added 40,000, taken from the classes before that of 1810. By joining the Polish, the Italians, and the Germans of the Rhine Confederation to the French, he was able to put in the field 425,000 men. No more formidable army had ever appeared before. Then Napoleon marched against Vienna, the center of the resistance, and, after the victories of Thann, Abendberg, Eckmül, and Ratisbon, he made his triumphal entry for the second time (May 13, 1809) into the capital of Austria.

---

[32] Pacca, *Mémoires,* I, 91.

[33] *Ibid.,* p. 56.

[34] Artaud, *op. cit.,* II, 335.

Now he could turn toward Rome. Four days after his entry into Vienna, he signed the two decrees that finally united the Papal States to the French Empire, declaring Rome to be a free imperial city and creating an extraordinary council to take possession of the Roman states in his name.[35] The king of Naples, Murat, was chosen to direct the occupation of the Papal States.

Sentence of Excommunication

Pius VII foresaw these decrees and the brutal application that would be made of them. In that foresight he secretly prepared two bulls: one simplified the conditions for the election of the future pope in the event that the College of Cardinals should find themselves scattered at the time of the vacancy of the Holy See; the other bull pronounced sentence of excommunication against the invaders of the Papal States.

---

[35] Haussonville, *op. cit.*, III, 80.

On June 11, by order of General Miollis, the Emperor's decree joining the states of the pope to the Empire was placarded along the streets of Rome; with the sound of artillery salvos, the papal flag was lowered from the Castle Sant' Angelo, and the tricolor flag was run up. As Pacca relates, "The time was two o'clock in the afternoon. I rushed to the appartment of the Holy Father and, as we met, both of us in the same breath uttered these words of the Redeemer: *Consummatum est.*' "[36] Then the Holy Father went to his table and there, without saying a word, signed the bull of excommunication. However, before transmitting it to those who were to post it, he went up to the Cardinal and said: "In our place, what would you do?" "Holy Father," replied Pacca, "I would publish the bull." The Pope raised his eyes toward heaven and, after a short pause, issued the order for posting the bull of excommunication "against the violators of the patrimony of St. Peter."[37] Official notification of the excommunication was given to the Emperor by a brief dated June 12, 1809. Unlike the bull, which indicated no person by name, this second document explicitly named Napoleon I, emperor of the French, as having incurred the excommunication.[38]

Informed of the sentence of excommunication, Napoleon wrote to the King of Naples (June 20): "At this moment I have received news that the Pope has excommunicated us. It is an excommunication that the Pope has issued against himself. . . . He is a wild fool, who must be interned. Arrest Cardinal Pacca and other adherents of the Pope." [39] This letter is dated from the palace of Schömbrunn, where twenty-one years later the little King of Rome died.

---

[36] Pacca, *op. cit.,* I, 112.

[37] For the entire text of the bull, see Pacca, *op. cit.,* I, 129–48.

[38] In a consultation with Bigot de Preameneu, Napoleon was assured that he was not affected by the bull, "because, according to the rules, penalties against invaders of ecclesiastical temporal goods did not touch sovereigns unless they had been expressly named." Bigot ignored the existence of the brief of June 12, 1809. For the text of this brief, see Welschingr, *op. cit.,* p. 84.

Murat already had orders to arrest the Pope in the event that he should preach revolt.[40] For the execution of this order, Murat at once appointed a man known for his abundant energy, General Radet. Etienne Radet, former cavalry lieutenant, was one of the brave officers who had attempted, in 1791, to save King Louis at Varennes. In 1794 he was brought before the revolutionary tribunal and, as if by a miracle, escaped sentence to capital punishment. Upon receipt of his fatal mission, Radet had a moment of hesitation; but he thought that "his oaths and his sacred duty obliged him to carry it out," and he obeyed.[41]

Arrest of Pius VII

On the night of July 5, by Radet's order, the Quirinal was surrounded by the troops. After an hour of violent attempts, by the use of scaling ladders and the smashing of doors, the soldiers, guided by a traitor, penetrated into the papal palace, with General Radet at their head. Pius VII, vested in mozzetta, rochet, and stole, awaited the invaders in his study. Radet writes: "Finding myself with an armed force before that sacred head, an oppressive and spontaneous movement ran through all my members. A holy respect filled my whole being." [42] At last the General approached and presented to the Pontiff for his signature a document that contained the removal of the excommunication. The Pope shoved it aside, saying: "In the whole affair I acted only after consulting the Holy Ghost, and you will rather tear me to pieces than make me retract what I have done." Then, after a moment of silence: "We cannot. We ought not. We will not." [43] "In that case," replied Radet, "I have orders to conduct you far from Rome."

---

[39] *Lettres inédites de Napoléon Ier*, I, 317.

[40] Letter of June 19.

[41] Radet, *Relation au pape Pie VII*. Radet wrote: "The military have duties so painful that a person is tempted to elude them. But a righteous man is sustained in his obedience by sworn faith and by honor." Radet, *Mémoires*, p. 171. Radet was sincere; but the error of his reasoning is evident. No promise or oath can dispense from the observance of the higher law of justice.

Thereupon Pius VII stood up and, without taking anything but his breviary, which he put under his arm, advanced to the door, giving his hand to Cardinal Pacca. Radet, greatly moved, bowed and kissed the papal ring. Pius VII left his apartment. Amid the debris of smashed doors, he slowly descended the great stairs and reached the Court of Honor, where the rest of the detachment was waiting. There the Pope gave a last blessing to the city of Rome, then entered a berlin that was waiting for him, while the soldiers, impressed by this majestic tranquillity, presented arms.[44]

The most precise details of the Pope's removal have been left us by the two personages who, in different capacities, were witnesses of it: General Radet and Cardinal Pacca. In their *Mémoires* you may read the account of the painful journey of the Holy Father from Rome to Savona, passing by the Chartreuse of Florence, Alessandria, Mondovi, Grenoble, Valence, Avignon, Aix, and Nice. Along the route of his exile, the Pontiff had the consolation of seeing the crowds thronging about him to ask his blessing. After traveling forty-one days, he arrived (August 16, 1809) at Savona, where he was to remain until June 19, 1812.

---

[42] Radet, *Mémoires.* "At that moment," Radet later said to Artaud, "my first Communion came to my mind." Artaud, *op. cit.*, III, 92.

[43] These words are the formula by which the parlements used to refuse the registration of the royal edicts: *Nec volumus, nec possumus, nec debemus.* Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 353.

[44] Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur*, p. 87.

The little city of Savona, located on the Gulf of Genoa and recently annexed to the French Empire, had been pointed out to Napoleon by Fouché to serve as the Pope's place of residence rather than Paris, where public opinion would have been more impressed by the Pontiff's presence. There he would be without official pomp, without insignia, for the Pope had brought with him no papal vestments, without counselor, for they separated him from Cardinal Pacca, without news, for orders were given to exercise watchful vigilance over his correspondence. Thus they hoped to wear down the Pope's patience, to obtain more easily from him what he had refused when the traditional pomp of the Quirinal and the Vatican surrounded him, giving him, as it were, the feeling of a universal empire. Fouché and Napoleon were mistaken. Isolated, without the marks of his power and without any relation with his advisers, the Pontiff "enclosed himself in a sort of immobility which was his force. Deprived of freedom, he did not budge a step, waiting to move only when freedom should be restored to him." [45]

Imprisonment of the Pope

Even more than the continental blockade, which had so deeply irritated the nations of Europe, this violent hand of the Emperor of the French laid upon the head of the Catholic Church was a threat for the peoples as well as for the rulers. Surely an imprisoned pope, never left out of sight by a sovereign, could not preserve over the Christian peoples the authority attached to his spiritual office. And might not the princes fear that the hand of the despot, not hesitating to lay hands on the highest majesty of this world, would some day descend cruelly on them? Said Pacca: "The nations shuddered at the deportation of Pius VII. Yet no protest was uttered. Not a protective voice came down from the Catholic thrones in favor of this illustrious captive."[46] From which of the European courts could a demand be expected? Austria, beaten to the earth, was still trembling from her defeat; Spain and the kingdom of Naples were a prey to the imperial tyranny; England and Portugal were at war with Napoleon; Russia, Prussia, and the little German states were indifferent to the blows struck at the Catholic Church. Of all the ruling princes, even the Catholic monarchs, the most independent and most nobly proud in the presence of the despot, was indeed the aged imprisoned Pontiff himself.[47]

---

[45] H. Chotard, *Le pape Pie VII à Savone.*

Pius VII had just reached his sixty-seventh year; fatigues and cares had seriously debilitated his physical health. Lodged, not in the Savona fortress, as some have held, but at first in the palace of Count Sanson, then soon afterward in the episcopal residence, in this latter house he occupied an apartment composed of two rooms and a loge from which he could follow the offices of the cathedral.[48] Chabrol (prefect of Montenotte), General Bertier (commander of the troops of the fortress), and Prince Borghese (governor of the departments beyond the Alps) had personally an esteem for the aged august prisoner; but letters from the Emperor, rude sometimes to coarseness, came in rapid succession to remind them of the strictness of their task. One day Bertier received orders to arrest the former confessor of the Pope, as being "a scoundrel"; another day Prince Borghese was admonished to make considerable savings on the amount assigned for the Pope's subsistence.[49]

---

[46] Pacca, *Mémoires,* X.

[47] Welschinger, *op. cit.,* p. 100.

[48] At the bishop's house in Savona you can still see the two rooms that were occupied by Pius VII and the balcony from which each evening he blessed the city.

[49] Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* p. 93. See especially Mayol de Lupe, *La captivité de Pie VII,* according to unpublished documents, 1912.

Napoleon's Divorce

What, then, were the great plans of the potentate? Now that everything seemed to be his, the souls as well as the bodies,[50] where was his ambition leading him? Was he, like Joseph II, going to regulate by himself the details of Catholic worship, or, like Louis XIV, try to screen his pretended rights under the prestige of an assembly of the clergy, or, like Philip the Fair, attempt to frighten the Pope by some violent aggression? None of these undertakings gave him hesitation; but, for the moment, another object absorbed him: to break the childless marriage with Josephine Beauharnais, which he had entered into reluctantly on the eve of his coronation. As his power became strengthened, his desire to assure himself of a legitimate heir, by a marriage with the daughter of some sovereign, had increased at the same time. In 1807 he drew up a list of marriageable princesses in the different European courts.[51] A project of union with the Grand Duchess Anne, sister of Czar Alexander, did not succeed because of the demands of the Russian court; he then turned his choice to the Archduchess of Austria, Maria Louisa. But Emperor Francis II, knowing of the ceremony performed on the eve of Napoleon's coronation, was unwilling to give his daughter unless the religious marriage with Josephine should be dissolved.

We will not relate the moving scene of December 15, 1809, when Napoleon and Josephine, in a family council, declared that they separated voluntarily, "both of them glorious at the sacrifice made for the good of the country," nor of the solemn session that took place the next day in the Senate to receive the declaration of the two spouses and, by a decree of the Senate, to regulate the situation of Josephine.[52] The capital difficulty remained: to have the religious authority declare the nullity of the marriage contracted on December 1, 1804.

---

[50] Let us recall the expression of Napoleon when he was first consul: "The priests take the souls and leave me only the corpses."

[51] This document is in the national archives, containing eighteen names, ten being names of Protestant princesses.

Napoleon had at hand an acute and crafty jurist, Cambacérès, whose learned juridical devices had more than once enabled him to succeed in similarly embarrassing cases. The archchancellor of the Emperor was not unaware that, according to the very principles of the Gallican Church and historic traditions, the marriage of princes was one of the major causes that must be referred to the Supreme Pontiff. If they could have hoped from the prisoner of Savona a reply favorable to the Emperor's desire, the solution would be simple: to request the Pontiff to sanction by his supreme authority the declaration of nullity of the marital bond contracted between the Emperor Napoleon and Josephine. But all the circumstances convinced them that the Pope, even though an isolated prisoner, would show the inflexibility which he had manifested in the case of the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte and Elizabeth Patterson. In the present case Cambacérès judged that the Gallican traditions could not be applied, that they took into account only ordinary cases and not exceptional situations such as the one in the present instance. More conformable to those traditions would be the substitution, in place of a Roman commission, whose functioning was impossible, a system of jurisdiction composed of French ecclesiastical tribunals. For the present case, therefore, they instituted a procedure in three degrees: diocesan court, metropolitan court, and the primatial court of Lyons.[53]

---

[52] On Napoleon's divorce, see Welschinger, *Le divorce de Napoléon,* 1889; Geoffroy de Grandmaison, *Napoléon et les cardinaux noirs;* Lecoy de la Marche, "Le mariage religieux de Napoléon et de Josephine," in *La guerre aux erreurs historiques;* Dudon, "Le divorce de Napoleon, lettre inédite du cardinal Fesch," in *Etudes* (August 25, 1901), pp. 606–22.

[53] This last, in fact, as we shall see later on, was not consulted.

On December 22, 1809, the officialis and the promoter of Paris, upon the order of Cambacérès, learned the will of the master. The archchancellor of the Empire gave them to understand that he did not expect from them any long delays and that they had no need to follow the usual forms. The promoter, Father Rudemare, though keenly affected, could not refrain from sustaining the rights of the Holy See and, to shield his responsibility, asked that his competence in the case be submitted to a higher ecclesiastical authority.

In the month of November, 1809, the Emperor, on the pretext that the Pope was disturbing the functions of the capitular vicar during the vacancy of episcopal sees,[54] had constituted, under the presidency of Cardinal Fesch, a council of eight theologians, called "The Ecclesiastical Council." In that council could be seen, at the side of men absolutely devoted to the Emperor, such as Cardinal Maury and Bishop Manny of Trier, other ecclesiastics of great learning and solid virtue, such as Father Fontana, general of the Barnabites, and Father Emery, superior of the Sulpicians. These last, having entered this council with apprehensive anxieties of conscience,[55] were obliged, on occasion, to oppose the Emperor, on more than one point, with effective resistance; and we should properly recognize that Cardinal Fesch, whose presidency of the council was owing to his relationship to the Emperor, showed a sincere will to keep the imperial policy within the limits of respect due the Roman pontiff.[56] Did he thereby wish to make reparation for the grievous wrongs of his conduct at Rome during his period as ambassador there? However this may be, the Ecclesiastical Council, consulted on the question of the competence of the diocesan court, answered with a favorable opinion.[57]

---

[54] Napoleon I, *Mémoires,* I, 121.

[55] Father Emery wrote on this occasion to his friend, the Bishop of Alais: "How I should bless an illness that would come to me in these circumstances, even though it would carry me off!" Meric, *op. cit.,* II, 327.

[56] On the testimony of the chancellor Pasquier, see his *Mémoires,* I, 440.

The inquiry began. Three witnesses, Berthier, Duroc, and Talleyrand, affirmed that "several times they heard His Majesty say that he did not intend to engage himself and did not consider himself in any way bound by an act that had neither the character nor the solemnity prescribed." Cardinal Fesch declared that two days after the marriage the Emperor declared to him that "all he had done had no other purpose than to quiet the Empress and to yield to the circumstances; that at the very moment when he was founding an empire he could not give up the prospect of offspring in the direct line." Cambacérès urged that the general powers given by the Pope to Cardinal Fesch had for their purpose only to permit him, at the most, to take the place of the proper pastor, whom they did not have time to notify, but not to dispense from all the required formalities, such as the presence of witnesses, etc.

The diocesan court took cognizance only of this second cause of nullity: the omission of the required formalities. It did not dare invoke the defect of consent; this reason it discarded, according to the expression of one of its members, "out of respect for His Majesty"; for, said Father Rudemare, "how could we urge, in favor of a man who made us all tremble, a reason for nullity which was never usefully appealed to except for a minor taken by surprise and under duress?" Consequently (January 9, 1810) the officialis of Paris, Father Boislève, rendered a decision by which, "considering the difficulty of recourse to the visible head of the Church, to whom, in fact, always belonged the cognizance and decision of these extraordinary cases," the marriage contracted between Emperor Napoleon and Empress Josephine, without the presence of the required witnesses and the proper pastor, was declared null.

---

[57] On the canonical reasons for this view and on the attitude of Father Emery in this affair, see Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 247–49.

Three days later the metropolitan court came to the same conclusion, but taking for the chief basis the lack of consent by the parties to the marriage. By this decision, notice of which was duly given by the French ambassador at the court of Vienna, the difficulties advanced by the Emperor of Austria fell; and, by his marriage, celebrated April 2, 1810, with Princess Maria Louisa, granddaughter of the great Queen Maria Theresa and niece of King Louis XVI, Napoleon Bonaparte not only had the hope of establishing a dynasty, but also found himself connected with the greatest sovereign houses.[58] He had reached the summit of human glory.

On April 2, in the great gallery of the Louvre, brilliantly adorned and illuminated, his proud look might have surveyed with satisfaction the long row of generals, senators, ministers, princes, and kings who formed a sort of escort for him, while he took by the hand, as wife and almost as a trophy, the descendant of the Hapsburgs.

However, on coming forth from the religious ceremony, a frown of anger darkened the face of the Emperor. His intimates had heard him murmur words that made them tremble: "Ah! the fools. . . . To protest against the legitimacy of my race! To unsettle my dynasty!" The Emperor had noted about the altar, among the reserved places, thirteen vacant seats. Out of twenty-seven cardinals whom he had brought and kept at Paris, only fourteen resigned themselves to attend the ceremony; the others, considering that the unlawfulness of the Emperor's first marriage had not been recognized by the Pope, were courageous enough to absent themselves. Pius VII, in fact, upon learning at Savona the decisions handed down by the courts of Paris, protested against the irregularity of that procedure.[59]

---

[58] The fiercest adversaries of Napoleon were at this moment much impressed by this alliance. De Maistre (February 25, 1810) wrote to King Victor Emmanuel: "This wonderful man has finally married the daughter of the Austrian Emperor. With the matter decided, I have nothing to say, and I even believe that henceforth I ought to change my style in expressing myself with regard to this personage, who at present should be treated as another sovereign."

The Emperor had succeeded in only half of his designs: everything gave him hope of founding a great dynasty, but the head of the Catholic Church had not bent before him.

The thirteen cardinals who had avoided appearing at the ceremony were summoned to the ministry of worship. Their pensions were suppressed; their personal goods were seized; they were ordered to withdraw two by two to cities of the provinces and to remove the cardinalitial insignia. Hence arose the name of "black cardinals," which has been preserved in history.[60] Besides, Napoleon was strengthened in the project of organizing a system of Church government apart from the Pope and the Sacred College. With this organization once assured, people would see whether the Pope himself would not be obliged to accept the situation. The formation of an ecclesiastical council, the calling of the national council of 1811, and the concordat of Fontainebleau were the steps in execution of this new plan.

The French Church

An ecclesiastical council had functioned at Paris from November, 1809, to January, 1810. We have just seen that it determined the competence of the French courts in the question of the Emperor's marriage. But questions of a more general sort had been submitted to it. At the end of November, the minister of worship proposed to it, in the name of the government, three series of questions: the first, on what concerned the affairs of Christianity in general; the second, on those of France in particular; the third, on those of Germany and Italy. In what concerned the affairs of France, the Emperor insisted upon four well determined points and called for precise replies. The questions regarded: (1) juridically fixing the rights of the Emperor over the Papal States; (2) finding the means to render useless the canonical institution of the bishops; (3) proving that the bull of excommunication was not effective, and (4) establishing, in the Emperor's favor, the right to convoke a national council without the intervention of the Pope.

---

[59] The Pope's protest, we may remark, never concerned anything but the irregularity of the procedure. Whether through prudence or out of respect for the rules of canon law, by virtue of which a higher tribunal takes cognizance of a case only by the appeal of one of the parties, or because the fundamental question did not appear clear to him, the Pope never pronounced on the validity of Napoleon's first marriage. According to Father Rohrbacher (*Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* XII, 45), here was a genuine cause of nullity, which no one dared mention, but which determined the votes of the courts. Cf. Méric, *op. cit.,* II, 339.

[60] G. de Grandmaison, *Les cardinaux noirs.*

Father Fontana, the general of the Barnabites, because of illness had unfortunately to be absent after the first sessions. Father Emery, who took part in several discussions, always used the language of a theologian devoted to the Church and to the Holy See. Such is the testimony given him particularly by Frayssinous, who was added to the commission as secretary, as also that of Father Rauzan. But his views were not successful in winning the bishops. The answers of the latter showed the embarrassment of men who feared to violate the principles too strongly and yet were primarily solicitous not to wound the vanity of an irascible man, whose iron hand was already laid so heavily on the vicar of Jesus Christ and might indulge in new deeds of violence.

With a compliance that could not be excused by a few timid reservations in favor of the pontiff imprisoned at Savona, the commission declared: "that the pope cannot, for the simple reason of temporal affairs, refuse his intervention in spiritual affairs," as if the outrages against the freedom of the head of the Church, which were the reason for refusal of the bulls to the nominated bishops, had been a purely temporal affair. On the subject of the means to be employed to supplement the defect of the bulls, the commission, after first evading a solution of this question and proposing to submit it to a national council, finally declared, upon the repeated demand of the Emperor, that the national council could, "according to the urgency of the circumstances," enact that the canonical institution would be given by the metropolitan or the eldest suffragan. Lastly, regarding the bull of excommunication, the commission declared it null and of no effect, "as having been issued only in behalf of temporal interests." [61] Father Fontana, because of illness, had not been present at most of the sessions. Father Emery, seeing in the questions presented by the Emperor a predetermination to impose his wishes, rarely came to the meetings of the Council, where he warmly defended the rights of the Holy See,[62] and refused to sign the replies. These were transmitted to the Emperor on January 11, 1810.[63]

Provided with these new arms, Napoleon lost no time in promulgating (February 17, 1810) a Senate decree which proclaimed the union of the States of Rome to the Empire, and declared that "the imperial prince would bear the title and receive the honors of king of Rome." Thus, "several weeks before the Austrian marriage and many months before the birth of a son, Napoleon decreed that this son would be an heir who would occupy the preponderant place in the city of the popes; that he would be the king and would receive royal honors." [64] The Senate decree also bore this haughty title: "On the independence of the imperial throne over all authority on earth." We know what happened to this proud dream: when barely four years old, the King of Rome no longer had a crown and, in the eyes of Europe, he was merely an Austrian prince.

---

[61] Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 238. The replies of the council have been given by Talleyrand with some abbreviations. Talleyrand, *Mémoires,* II, 52. On the Church council of 1809–1810, see the profound study by Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* pp. 82–138.

[62] See Gosselin, *op. cit.,* pp. 239–43, for Father Emery's attitude.

[63] Talleyrand, *Mémoires,* II, 71.

[64] Welschinger, *Le roi de Rome,* p. 3.

Napoleon's religious marriage with the Archduchess of Austria did but exalt still more the potentate's insatiable ambition. Says the historian of the religious conflicts of this period: "From this moment Napoleon no longer observed the least consideration for the Holy Father." [65] He pictured himself master of the Eternal City, which he intended to make one of the capitals of his great empire. "This empire," he said, "will rise higher than it has ever been since the last of the Caesars. To myself I reserve the glory of appearing as its father." Providence never allowed Napoleon to realize this desire. But meanwhile the Emperor did not hide his idea: to accomplish the political ruin of the papacy and to leave it only the appearance of spiritual power. To all bishops going to Savona orders were given that they should try to wring from the Pope the surrender of all his prerogatives. "The entire decree of the Senate, and nothing but that"; [66] such was the watchword of the Emperor.

Had the Emperor of Austria, following the old traditions of the "apostolic" monarchy, wished then to take in hand the cause of Pius VII or at least to intervene in his behalf, the occasion was presented to him by the unforeseen alliance he had just contracted with the Emperor of the French. An intervention did take place, but in a way not to compromise the Austrian monarchy in a delicate negotiation. The one chosen for this negotiation was that Prince Metternich, who was not unacquainted with knotty situations and was not without ability in unraveling them. But he seemed to have for his motto the words of Walpole: *Quieta non movere* ("Do not stir up things that are quiet"). At Vienna he continued the Josephist traditions, full of distrust for the papal authority. No one was less suited to be a knight of the papacy in a diplomatic mission. Besides, we know today, by the publication of the *Mémoires* of the illustrious statesman, the basic inspiration of his measures.

---

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Therein he sees the occasion to pursue the dominant idea of his whole policy: to raise up again and develop the Austrian supremacy. He wrote to Francis I: "If the attempt does not succeed, Your Majesty will nevertheless have played a fine role." [67] What mattered to him was this role rather than success. Napoleon made him some fine promises: he agreed "to remain faithful to the religion of St. Louis and not to raise any schism over spiritual questions." But what did Napoleon mean by "spiritual questions"? We know how singularly he limited their scope. As for the Pope, Napoleon recognized him as bishop of Rome, but expressed the hope and desire that he should reside in Paris, where he would be closer to Madrid, Lisbon, and Vienna.

Such were the declarations which satisfied the Austrian plenipotentiary. These he transmitted to his government in a report dated May 10, 1810. That very day Napoleon at Breda in Holland gave an audience to the members of the two clergies, Protestant and Catholic. The latter he upbraided insultingly, saying to them: "Bigots! If the matter depended on you, you would throw me into a monastery, like Louis the Pious. . . . God is the one who has placed me on my throne. . . . I must render account of my conduct only to God and Jesus Christ, not to a pope. . . . You have calumniated the Protestants. I have 600,000 Protestants in my empire, and never have I had occasion to complain of one of them." [68]

Ten days later the Pope wrote a brief to the Austrian ambassador, Lebzeltern. Therein he declared that he gladly renounced all the material advantages that might be offered him, but he forcibly rejected all schemes that would injure the dignity of the Church and he asked above all the opportunity to communicate with his faithful.[69]

[67] Metternich, *Mémoires,* II, 333–55.

[68] F. Schoell, *Recueil de pieces officielles,* IV, 247. Quoted by Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* p. 125.

[69] Chotard, *Le pape Pie VII à Savone,* p. 124.

The sturdy resistance of the one whom he had hoped to master by isolating him exasperated the Emperor. On July 25, 1810, he ordered Prince Eugene to have a number of religious arrested, as being guilty of expressing their sympathy for the Pope. On November 1 on his own authority he appointed to the archbishopric of Paris, Cardinal Maury, who had the weakness to accept the appointment.[70] This act brought grief to Pius VII, who at once wrote to the Cardinal: "Thus, after courageously pleading the cause of the Church in times of storm, you now abandon her who has lavished on you her dignities and favors." The unworthy prince of the Church perhaps found that the dignities and favors offered by the Emperor of the French more appreciable.

Napoleon heaped favors on him. On the other hand, in the new ecclesiastical council, which he formed in January, 1811, under the presidency of Fesch, the Emperor counted especially on Maury to defend his religious policy. The new committee included, along with Fesch and Maury, Cardinal Caselli, the archbishops of Tours and Malines, the bishops of Evreux, Treves, and Nantes. Napoleon wished also that Father Emery should be added. The anguish of the superior of St. Sulpice revived. After vainly begging the Emperor to excuse him from such a mission or, at least, to give him merely a consultative voice, he felt that he ought to accept, not having lost all hope of exercising over the members of the committee an influence favorable to the rights of the Church.

He did not suspect what low servility lay in the soul of Maury, who but recently from Rome, where he was living in the midst of the *émigré* nobles, had so bitterly reproached Father Emery for his so-called weakness toward the established powers, showed himself a most complacent flatterer of the despot. On the other hand, when Napoleon was irritated and wished to force from the lips of the members of the ecclesiastical council, some words of disavowal about the Supreme Pontiff, he found before him a man courageous enough to resist him to his face. This man was precisely the superior of St. Sulpice.

---

[70] Cardinal Fesch, to whom the Emperor turned first, had the courage to refuse.

On March 16, 1811, the Emperor had summoned the ecclesiastical council to the palace of the Tuileries, in the presence of Cambacérès, Talleyrand, and the members of the Council of State. Napoleon had a fondness for these imposing manifestations, and knew how to exploit them to his advantage. Artaud de Montor gives the details of this meeting, according to a note found in the papers of Consalvi.

> The Emperor, who made them wait for two hours, said that they were blockheads. Napoleon appeared in extraordinary apparel, encompassed by his great officers, and he opened the session with a long and vehement address against the Pope. Although this discourse was a tissue of vile calumnies, none of the cardinals or bishops seem to have attempted to declare the truth against the might and power. But, for the glory of religion, a simple ecclesiastic was there who would save the honor of the state which he professed. That man was Father Emery. He had not wished to attend the assembly. Cardinal Fesch had sent two bishops to find the modest Sulpician.
>
> After speaking with violence, Napoleon looked at all those present, and then said to Father Emery: "What do you think of the Pope's authority?" Father Emery, directly questioned, with deference turned his eyes to the bishops, as if to ask permission to be the first to express his opinion, and then answered: "Sire, I can give no other view on this point than that which is contained in the catechism taught by your orders in all the churches; to the question, 'What is the pope?' the answer is given that he is 'the head of the Church, the vicar of Jesus Christ.' " "But Jesus Christ did not give him the temporal power: it was Charlemagne who gave it to him; and I, the successor of Charlemagne, wish to take it from him, because it keeps him from exercising his spiritual functions." "Sire," Father Emery replied, "Your Majesty honors the great Bossuet and is pleased to quote him often. I will quote verbatim from him this passage, which I well remember. Sire, Bossuet

speaks thus: 'To the Apostolic See were conceded the sovereignty of the city of Rome and other possessions that the Holy See, freer and more assured, might exercise its power throughout the world. . . . For this we felicitate the universal Church and we heartily pray that this sacred principality may remain safe and sound.' "

Napoleon then spoke mildly, as he always did when he was fearlessly contradicted, and he said: "I do not reject the authority of Bossuet. All that was true in his day, when Europe acknowledged several masters. At that time it was not fitting that the pope should be subject to an individual ruler; but what is unsuitable in the pope's being subject to me, now that Europe recognizes no other master but me alone?" Father Emery was at first a bit embarrassed. Yet he replied: "Sire, you know the history of revolutions as well as I do. What now exists may at some time cease to exist. The improprieties foreseen by Bossuet may reappear. An order so wisely established ought not to be changed.[71]

The date was March 16, 1811, when Father Emery dared to say: "What now exists may at some time cease to exist." Three years later Napoleon, abandoned by all, signed his abdication; and the very one of whom he said: "I will never let him enter Rome," returned there as sovereign, in spite of Napoleon.

French National Council of 1811

The words of the venerable priest produced a strong impression on the Emperor's mind. When some prelates, at the close of the meeting of March 26, sought to excuse the superior of St. Sulpice by alleging his advanced age, Napoleon replied: "I am not irritated against Father Emery. He has spoken as a man who knows his subject. I like people to speak to me thus." [72] But he did not give up his idea of convoking a national council.

[71] Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, III, 14–17.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

On June 17, 1811, ninety-five prelates, assembled at the archiepiscopal palace, celebrated the opening of this council. We will not recount the details of the council.[73] We shall merely say that, on the essential points, the council declined to bend to the imperial will. The example given by Father Emery had revived their courage. The bishops required in the first place that the Pope be set free. As for the Emperor's claim to do without papal institution of the bishops, the prelates plainly declared that they saw no means of dispensing with the papal bulls and that the council was without competence in the matter, even to give a provisional decision and in an urgent case. A report drawn up to this effect by the Bishop of Tournai put the Emperor in a state of deep irritation. On the evening of July 10 an imperial decree declared the council dissolved. Two days later, at three o'clock in the morning, the bishops of Tournai, Gand, and Troyes, these last two chaplains of the Emperor, were arrested in their beds and imprisoned at Vincennes.

Deplorable was the effect of this violence. In an attempt to allay the state of public opinion, a rumor was spread that the three bishops had entered into relations with the enemies of the state.[74] This subterfuge, which was soon abandoned, deceived no one. Moreover, the *ab irato* interruption of the deliberations did not bring any solution to the serious questions that had prompted the convocation of a council. Maury, who is said to have been flattered at again enjoying, in this assembly, the oratorical successes of the Constituent Assembly, and to be plotting the intrigues that he had carried on at Rome, appeared to be particularly mortified.[75] On the advice of the

[73] A learned treatment of them will be found in a long chapter of Welschinger, who was the first one to consult, in the national archives, all the unpublished documents concerning the council. Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* pp. 197–287.

[74] Pasquier, *Mémoires,* I, 483.

[75] Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* IV, 344.

Archbishop of Paris, the Emperor requested the dispersed bishops not to leave Paris and, when the presence of a respectable number of the prelates was assured, they were gathered in a preliminary assembly to ask for the reopening of the council. This reopening was authorized by imperial degree. On August 5, without discussion, the mutilated assembly adopted a decree which, in case of refusal or abstention by the pope, after six months gave to the metropolitan or the dean of the bishops of the province the right to confer canonical institution on the nominated bishops.[76]

After this result was obtained, most of the bishops remained at Paris to await the return of a deputation sent to Savona. On September 20, Pius VII, circumvented and deprived of complete information, being desirous of ending the widowhood of so many Churches, signed a brief which accepted the decisions of August 5, but with some important modifications. Thus the Pope required that the canonical institution given by the metropolitan must be made "in the name of the Supreme Pontiff."[77] Napoleon, not satisfied with these modifications, imperiously sent from Gorcum, where he then was, an order to all the bishops to return to their dioceses without delay and informed the Pope that he himself would institute the bishops and, if there should be need, would annul the Concordat.[78]

Even though a prisoner, even deprived of all relations with the outside, enfeebled by age and illness, the old man of Savona refused to bend before the orders of the Emperor. The latter then thought of a supreme means of overcoming what he called "the headstrong obstinacy of the Roman priest": to bring the Pope to Paris, where he would be close at hand, and there by a direct pressure of that will which nothing resisted, to induce the Pontiff to subscribe to all his claims.

---

[76] Welschinger, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 334.

[78] *Ibid.*

Pius VII at Fontainebleau

Pius VII, through M. de Chabrol, prefect of Montenotte, received (June 9, 1812) the following letter: "Most Holy Father. The known plan of the English to make a descent on the coast of Savona with a view of taking you off obliges the French government to have Your Holiness come to the capital. Consequently orders have been given that Your Holiness come first to Fontainebleau, where you will have the lodging which you already occupied. Your Holiness will remain at Fontainebleau only until the apartments are prepared at the archiepiscopal palace in Paris, where you will then live." Only a few hours was given the Pope for leaving Savona.

Haussonville relates, following an authentic report, the sad incidents of that hurried journey; the Pontiff's departure in the middle of the night, in a padlocked carriage; the grievous illness from which Pius VII was suffering in the course of the journey, at Mt. Cenis, where he nearly succumbed to atrocious pains; the arrival (June 19) at Fontainebleau, where, contrary to the promises, nothing had been prepared to receive the Pontiff, and the installation of the supreme head of the Church in a modest lodge, furnished for the porter of the château.

At that time Napoleon was far from Paris. Never perhaps did he think himself nearer the realization of his grandiose dream. On June 24, 1812, he crossed the Niemen and was threatening Russia, as he exclaimed: "The destinies are about to be fulfilled." Once conqueror of the czar, would he not be able to do what he wished with the Pope? Napoleon was reckoning without the formidable might of the Russian Empire, without the severity of the climate, and without the just decrees of divine Providence.

Everyone knows about the disasters that befell the Grand Army: the dreadful Moscow fire, the premature snowfall, the sudden upset of all the plans of campaign, discouragement replacing enthusiasm, and, notwithstanding the heroic efforts of Ney, Drouot, officers, and soldiers, the retreat from Russia transformed into a catastrophe, while in France the conspiracy of General Malet, who almost succeeded, showed that the Empire in the absence of its head was at the mercy of a surprise coup.

Napoleon returned to the Tuileries (December 18, 1812) and, after attending to urgent matters, informed the Pope (December 29) of his desire "to put an end to the differences that were dividing the state and the Church." This first overture was the preliminary of the negotiations that were carried on between the bishops of Treves and Evreux, representing the Emperor, and four Italian cardinals representing the Pope.[79]

Napoleon's plan was said to be to weary, by prolonged conferences, the spirit of the Pontiff, already much weakened, and to await, for personal intervention, the Pope's state of prostration which would leave him defenseless.[80] The conjecture is quite probable. At any rate, in the evening of January 19, 1813, the prisoner of Fontainebleau saw the Emperor abruptly enter the sitting room where he was, cast himself into the Pope's arms, kiss his face, and make a thousand expressions of friendship toward him. Says Artaud: "The Pope always liked something in Napoleon's qualities. In the boundless goodness of his heart, he had always attributed the evil treatment to which he was subjected to wicked subalterns. He seemed to be satisfied with these outward demonstrations; to the persons whom he saw habitually he recounted these expressions, and he did not forget the embrace and kiss of Napoleon." [81] At this little first evening meeting, no business matters were brought up.

These matters were introduced the next day. Five hours passed in long and serious discussions. History must forego an account of the incidents. The famous scene so dramatically described by Alfred de Vigny does not rest on any authentic testimony. The words of *Commediante* and of *Tragediante* were never uttered.[82] But we know with certainty that Napoleon spoke to the august and enfeebled Pontiff with full military rudeness. The Pope, several times questioned on the fact that he was struck by the Emperor, always answered that the accusation was not true. He said: "No, the Emperor did not resort to such an indignity, and God permits that on this occasion we have not to utter a falsehood." [83]

---

[79] Cardinals Doria, Dugnani, Ruffo, and Bayane.

[80] Artaud, III, 36.

[81] *Ibid.*

The Concordat

Pius VII was then seventy-one years old. As we learn from Artaud, "physical ailments, a sensibility stirred by the desire of again seeing the cardinals that were being kept prisoners, the importunity of Bertalozzi who urged him to accord everything, the entreaties of certain Italian cardinals who wore him out with menacing conjectures, the absolute silence of any wise and high-minded voice coming to relieve that soul afflicted with suffering: all contributed to discourage the Pontiff." On the evening of January 25, 1813, he was presented with a project that was to serve as a basis for a final agreement, and to which he was asked to attach his name. The aged august Pontiff turned imploringly to the four cardinals present (Doria, Dugnani, Ruffo, and Bayane). Napoleon too was there, attentive and impatient. From the cardinals not a word, not a sign that could make known to the Pope what advice they had to offer. But the previous evening they had told him that his duty was to put an end to the sufferings of the Church, to the exile of his counsellors, to the imprisonment of his priests. Pius VII put his signature on the document, and at once the Emperor signed his name beside that of the Pope.

---

[82] Alfred de Vigny, *Servitude et grandeur militaires,* chap. 5.

[83] Artaud, III, 37.

Pius VII had signed the so-called concordat of 1813, which Napoleon hastened to promulgate and to make obligatory for the whole Empire. The main provisions of the treaty were the following: the pope, who would receive an income of 2,000,000 francs, would fix his see in Italy or in France; the full right to appoint bishops in the whole Empire would belong to the Emperor, with the exception of the suburbicarian sees and ten others to be determined; further, the decree of the national council would remain in force. In return for these concessions, the cardinals and the imprisoned bishops would immediately be freed.

This act was an implicit renunciation of the Papal States; it was an abandonment of the rights for which the strife had hitherto been carried on. As the "black cardinals," Gabrielli, Pietro, especially Pacca and Consalvi, arrived at Fontainebleau, the Pope's conscience, enlightened by the advice of these prudent counsellors, who had been so cruelly separated from him, awoke the most poignant regrets. His grief was profound; for several days he abstained from celebrating Mass. The opinion of the newly arrived cardinals was that the Pope ought to protest, by a letter written by his own hand, against the concordat as null and void, inasmuch as it was extorted from him by fraud and violence. This letter [84] was signed March 24, 1813. Six weeks later it was followed by a brief pronouncing null the institutions that might be given by the metropolitans, the bishops thus instituted as intruders, and the consecrating bishops as schismatic.

From this moment the Holy Father recovered his serenity. He said to his cardinals: "I feel my heart relieved of an enormous weight." However, he might well be fearful of the effects of his letter and his brief.

---

[84] The full text may be seen in Pacca, *Mémoires,* II, 131–40.

Events would have to solve the situation. On April 25 Napoleon had gone to take command of the army in Germany, counting on returning after his victory to obtain satisfaction from the unmanageable old man. The success of the battle of Lutzen (May 2) enlivened his hopes. A circular communicated the news of the victory to all the bishops of the Empire, and a letter announced it to the Pope as a happy event for religion as well as for the Empire. But the victory of Lutzen was destined to be the last smile of Napoleon's good fortune. On October 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1813, the coalition of Europe delivered to the Emperor of the French one of the bloodiest battles known in history, the famous Battle of the Nations, which saw 120,000 men fall on the fields of Leipsic. Two months later, in the night of December 31, 1813, a foreign army of 200,000 men crossed the Rhine; and almost at the same time, by the frontiers of Germany, Switzerland, and Spain, 800,000 men (Russians, Austrians, Germans, Swedes, English, and Spaniards) invaded France.

Confronted by the foreign invasion, Napoleon wished to rid himself of his prisoner. He had him taken to Savona (January 23, 1814); on March 10 he had the Pontiff set at liberty. The Pope reached Rome on May 24, after a triumphal journey. Napoleon had signed his abdication April 11, in that same palace of Fontainebleau which he had wished to make a prison for the vicar of Christ.[85]

[85] Within a short interval the people of the Midi saw two processions pass, that of the Pope and that of the Emperor. Cardinal Pacca relates that, while the Pope was crossing the Rhone on the bridge of boats from Beaucaire to Tarascon, the inhabitants of the two cities gathered together to offer him the testimony of a most tender veneration. Nothing could be heard but shouts of joy, applause, felicitations. Colonel Lagorse, charged with conducting the Pope, then said to this whole people: "What, then, would you do if the Emperor were passing?" To these words the people answered: "We would give him a drink." As the colonel became angry, one of the most violent of the crowd cried out to him: "Colonel, are you thirsty also?" Artaud, III, 81. He thus predicted what happened two months later, at Orgon, where the dethroned Emperor, according to Thiers' expression, experienced "the saddest humiliation of his life." To escape from the violence with which these ter-

Napoleon and the Protestants

"The Concordat, which in principle was a work of pacification and reconciliation, Napoleon tried little by little to turn into an instrument of personal domination." [86] An immense vanity explains the conduct of this man, whose genius was able to realize that restoration of the Church which France was waiting for after the ruins of the Revolution. That same vanity explains the policy he followed with regard to Protestantism, Judaism, and Freemasonry.

Fundamentally, we may believe, by his early education and his reason Napoleon was Catholic. The desire to make his Catholicism serve his personal ambition does not necessarily exclude the sincerity of his belief.[87] But his attitude toward the Protestants, Jews, and Freemasons seems inspired solely by political calculation.

At St. Helena, when an Irish doctor asked Napoleon if he had not encouraged the Freemasons, the prisoner replied: "A little, because they combated the Pope." [88] This reason and also the desire to seize considerable political forces for his own advantage also explains his policy toward the Protestants and Jews.

The organic law of 18 Germinal of the year X (August 8, 1802) had united the two chief Protestant religions, that which went back to Calvin and that which claimed its origin from Luther, on a footing of equality with the Catholic Church. On

---

rible Provençals were threatening him, for they had already prepared a gallows from which to hang him, Napoleon had to put on a foreign uniform so as to appear to be one of the officers of the escort. Thiers, *Histoire du consulat et de l'empire,* XVII, 834.

[86] Welschinger, p. 455.

[87] On Napoleon's religion, see Mathieu, *Le concordat de 1801,* pp. 30–33, 346. The celebrated text on the divinity of Christ seems to be authentic beyond question. See the book entitled *Sentiments de Napoléon sur le christianisme, conversations religieuses recueillies à Sainte-Hélène.* The words on first Communion seem not to be apocryphal, although they have been arranged.

[88] Account by O'Meara, quoted in *La correspondance de Napoléon,* XXXII, 394.

the day of his consecration Napoleon, receiving the president of the Geneva Consistory, who offered him the homage of all the Protestants, told him "how satisfied he was with the fidelity and the good conduct of the pastors and faithful of the different Protestant communions," and promised to protect the free exercise of their worship.[89] As we are told by a historian of Protestantism, "the Emperor abided by his promise. No persecution of the Protestants under his regime; no acts of violence in high or low places; a full and continuous security." [90] "No important book of dogma, Church history, or sacred eloquence is known which dates from the reign of Napoleon"; [91] but in 1808–10 the Emperor, by creating a faculty of Protestant theology at Montauban, favored the movement of studies in the Reformed Church; at Paris, churches were placed at the disposition of the Protestants, such as the church of St. Thomas of the Louvre, which they already had the use of, that of the abbey of Penthemont (rue de Grenelle), that of the Visitation (rue de Saint-Antoine), and in 1811 the large and beautiful church of the Oratory (rue Saint-Honoré). Under the Empire many Protestants occupied high posts, such as Senator Sers, Pelet de la Lozère the Counsellor of State, the tribunes Jaucourt and Boissy d'Anglas, the bankers Delessert and Mallet. We have seen that in Holland in 1811 the Emperor repeated to the Protestants the assurance of satisfaction that he gave them in 1804. How completely gratified he must have been! The Protestants offered incense to his power no less than the most complacent of the Catholics and they eagerly fought the power of the pope. In 1810 Rabaut-Pommier undertook to establish, by a well-ordered demonstration, that the coming of Napoleon had been announced by the prophets.[92] Nowhere was the feast of the fifteenth of August celebrated with greater ardor than in the Protestant temples; and several of the pastors justified the expression of Madame de Staël, who, in her famous report to the Directory, pointed to Protestantism as "the most formidable war machine" that could be used to oppose the papacy.[93]

---

[89] G. de Felice, *Histoire des protestants français,* p. 610.

[90] *Ibid.,* p. 611.

[91] *Ibid.,* p. 612.

[92] Grégoire, *Histoire des sectes religieuses,* II, 109.

Napoleon and the Jews

The law of 18 Germinal of the year X, which granted legal recognition to Catholic and Protestant worship, refused it to Jewish worship, because, said Portalis, "the Jews form a religion less than they do a people."[94] That religion was therefore neither regulated nor subsidized by the state.

Since the decrees of the Constituent Assembly the Jews enjoyed personally both civil and political equality. But precisely since they "formed a people" they constituted a power that Napoleon's genius could not but reckon with; for, according to the direction which that power might take, it could be useful or injurious to his cause. During his campaign in Italy, Napoleon valued the financial services which the Jewish banks of the Michels, Cerfbeers, and Bedarrides rendered to him. True, their exactions and the rigor they exercised in the prosecution of their debtors often stirred public opinion against them. In 1805 the Jews of Alsace, by their intervention in the sale of the national goods, and by their usurious loans, had particularly drawn the attention of the Emperor, who, by a decree of May 30, 1806, obliged them to submit, at least provisionally, to a regime of exception, to suspend for a year the execution of the judgments granted in their favor.[95] But this people, active and clever, seemed at the same time desirous of attaching themselves closely to the state. In their synagogue on rue Sainte

---

[93] Gautier, *Mme de Staël et Napoléon.*

[94] Boulay de la Meurthe, *op. cit.*, V, 387.

[95] Lemann, *Napoléon Ier et les Israelites,* pp. 18–24; Sagnac, "Les Juifs et Napoléon," in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* 1900 to 1902.

Avoye, the Parisian Jews were most exact in solemnizing all the great political events. The proclamation of the Empire and the coronation were there celebrated with Hebrew songs and speeches in French. Napoleon profited by these dispositions, which could not but flatter his ambition.

Noteworthy is the way he was affected by these dispositions. With the Catholics, who have a common doctrine and a single head, Napoleon was able to conclude a concordat. With the Protestants, who have neither, he proceeded by use of his own authority. But what was to be done in the case of the Jews? They did not have a single head, but they had a common doctrine. That doctrine was to some extent formerly safeguarded by the great Sanhedrin which had condemned Christ and St. Paul; and doubtless, if in 1806 it still had its seat at Jerusalem, Napoleon would have treated with it. But the great Sanhedrin, whose authority, moreover, had never been supreme, was now nothing but a distant remembrance. Napoleon's desire was to have before him some authority that could enlighten him on the principles professed by the Jews regarding the civil society and to assure him that none of their religious regulations were incompatible with the safety of the state. As that authority did not exist, he decided to form it.[96]

By Napoleon's order representatives of all the synagogues of the Empire were summoned to Paris and there met together under the name of Great Sanhedrin. The sessions of the assembly opened on February 10, 1807, in a hall next to the City Hall, and they continued until April 9. The imperial commissioners placed before the representatives of the Jewish religion the following questions: "Do you recognize France as your fatherland? Do you promise to obey its laws, notably the laws about the military service and monogamy? Lastly, do you admit that the rules of honesty and humanity, which you regard as obligatory with regard to your coreligionists, are likewise so regarding the French?" A decree of March 2, 1807, noted the affirmative answers that were made to these questions and registered them as "doctrinal decisions." [97] Several other decisions then regulated the legal situation of the Jews and their religious organization.

---

[96] Chenon, in *L'histoire générale,* IX, 270.

The most important of these legislative acts is the organic decree of March 17, 1808, which regulated the condition of the rabbis, synagogues, particular consistories, and the central consistory. This last was to be composed of three rabbis and two laymen, appointed the first time by the Emperor.[98]

This official recognition was welcomed by most of the Jews with triumphant gratefulness. An address by the Paris consistory (July, 1809) said: "Sire, to whom heaven has reserved the power to place man on an equality with man. . . . Thanks to your mighty genius, we are no longer strangers on the soil which has witnessed our birth." [99]

Napoleon and the Freemasons

Like the Jews, the Freemasons showed themselves quite disposed to place their undertakings under the protection of the Empire. Rebold informs us that, in 1801, at the Grand Orient they glorified "the idol of the day." [100] Did Napoleon respond fully to these advances? We may suppose so when we read the discourse delivered (June 23, 1810) in the Marie-Louise lodge at Rome by General Radet: "In this feast I proclaim the Emperor as the protector of Freemasonry, and I add this new title of glory to all those titles which have already been bestowed on him by the men whose welfare he has been." [101] The poet Arnault was doubtlessly exaggerating in the opposite sense when he summed up Napoleon's attitude by this expression, which the Emperor is supposed to have spoken regarding the Freemasons: "They are children amusing themselves; let them do so and watch over them." [102] The exact note seems to have been given by Portalis in a confidential report: "In France no one could destroy the meetings of men and women known under the general name of Masonic lodges. . . . The real means of preventing their degenerating into harmful assemblies has been to grant them a tacit protection by having them presided over by the chief dignitaries of the state." [103]

---

[97] Theodore Reinach, *Histoire des Israelites,* pp. 334–37.

[98] Lanzac de Laborie, *op. cit.,* p. 375.

[99] Lemann, *op. cit.,* pp. 114–20; Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations,* p. 341.

[100] Rebold, *Histoire des trois grandes loges,* p. 89.

[101] Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon,* p. 351; Bourgin, in the review, *La Révolution française,* I, 427.

What we are certain of is that the reorganization of the Grand Orient, which took place toward the end of 1803, was accomplished in a way to relieve the authority of all anxiety. The Council was largely composed of generals and high officials. Masonry had a great interest in relying on the public powers. Says Rebold: "In 1803 the Grand Orient, seeing that opposition was being renewed against its power, sought a greater support with the government. It succeeded in having the duties of the order's grand administrator accepted by general Massena, who was proclaimed in that capacity on December 18." [104] The next year the convention, called "The Concordat of 1804," by which the general Grand Lodge and the Supreme Council merged with the Grand Orient, was signed (December 3) in the house of Marshal Kellermann.[105] In 1805 the grand master Roettiers de Montaleau, the great restorer of Masonry, "nobly resigned," says the *Annals,* "and yielded his place to the prince Joseph

---

[102] Arnault, *Souvenirs d'un sexagénaire,* I, 150.

[103] Quoted by Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* IV, 377. "The statement of Napoleon's supposed affiliation to Freemasonry rests only on some vague data. The *Abeille maçonnique* affirms it; Besuchet (1829) holds that it took place on the island of Malta at the time of the Egyptian expedition. Landry reports that Emperor Napoleon on that day, along with Duroc and Lauriston, went to a lodge of the faubourg Saint-Marcel. These declarations are gratuitous." Max Doumic, *Le secret de la franc-maçonnerie,* p. 199.

[104] Rebold, *op. cit.,* p. 92.

[105] *Ibid.,* p. 94. On the general Grand Lodge and the Supreme Council, see *ibid.,* pp. 87, 95.

Bonaparte."[106] Rebold adds that Joseph Bonaparte had been named for the post of grand master by the Emperor himself.[107] Some of the chief officers of Masonry at this period were the following: grand master, prince Joseph Bonaparte; adjutant grand master, prince Louis Bonaparte; grand administrator, Marshal Masséna; first grand sentry, Marshal Murat; second grand sentry, Lacépède; grand orator, Lalande.[108] What was the genuine role of a society with such a staff? We know that the lodge of Neuf-Soeurs, faithful to its title, took a large share in the literary exercises. The lodge Sainte-Caroline, one of whose members was the Duchess de Carignan, mother of the future king of Sardinia, and another the former Duchess de Luynes, was distinguished by its dances and its gay banquets.

But behind these worldly celebrations, were political intrigues concocted? Were plots formed there against the Church and the papacy? The answer to such questions, according to the prudent remark of a certain historian, could be profitably looked for only in the archives of the rue Cadet.[109]

---

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[109] Bourgin, in the review, *La Révolution française,* II (1905), 52.

CHAPTER X

Last Years of Pius VII

PIUS VII's solemn entry into Rome took place on May 24, the feast of Our Lady Help of Christians. The Church, in her offices, in the celebration of this anniversary attributes to the protection of the Blessed Virgin the deliverance of the supreme head of the Church.[1] Cardinal Pacca, who had again become the faithful companion of the Pontiff, thus recalls the joys of that day, which he himself witnessed.

> Others have spoken at considerable length of the joy, devotion, and love which the good Roman people showed in that triumphal entry. For fear of describing something above the reality, I hesitate to speak of it. I will merely say that, wherever the carriage bearing the Holy Father passed, you could see a multitude of persons whose tears of joy choked their words.[2]

Before his arrival at Rome, Pius VII had given orders that a kindly welcome should be extended to the Emperor's mother, Madame Laetitia, who, after the manner of Mesdames Adelaide and Victoire (aunts of Louis XVI), of King Charles IV of Spain, of Queen Maria Louisa, and of many other royal persons stripped of their power, came to Rome to shelter great misfortune in the Eternal City. Shortly afterwards the Pope, through the intermediary of Consalvi, recommended the family of the dethroned Emperor to the generosity of the allied rulers.[3] Pius VII had never been able to rid himself of a sympathy for Napoleon. He believed in the Emperor's Christian dispositions; throughout his life the Pope remained under the charm of the great man with whom he had signed the concordat. In 1817, moved by the sufferings of the august prisoner at the time of his banishment to St. Helena, the Pope's magnanimity went so far as to ask of the Prince Regent of England an amelioration of the treatment that was being dealt out to his former persecutor. Napoleon's mother wrote (May 27, 1818): "We find no sympathy and refuge except in the papal government. I speak in the name of a whole family of the proscribed, especially in the name of him who is dying by slow torture on a barren rock." [4] Thus did the Pope take his revenge. The Emperor, at the time of his career's approaching end, mindful perhaps of this kindness, requested of Rome a priest to receive his last confidences and to assist him to pass in a Christian manner the last years of a life so glorious and so distressed.[5]

---

[1] See the Roman Breviary, feast of Our Lady Help of Christians, third lesson of the second nocturn.

[2] Pacca, *Mémoires,* I, 407.

[3] Letter to Consalvi, October 6, 1817, quoted by Haussonville, V, 347.

European Situation

But while the merciful heart of the Pontiff turned with pity to the misfortune of his fallen enemy, his attention was sharply drawn to the new situation created in Europe on the morrow of the great Emperor's fall. This situation would impose new duties on his apostolic solicitude.

An eminent Protestant historian, Leopold von Ranke, rightly remarks that the result of the great wars of Napoleon had been to rally round the Pope, not only the descendants of the Catholic sovereigns who had the most violently driven the Jesuits from their states, such as the kings of France, Spain, and Portugal, or who had most warmly sustained Jansenism, such as the sovereigns of Tuscany and Austria, but also the representatives of the Protestant or schismatic nations where the rationalism of Voltaire had found its strongest support, England, Germany, and Russia. When these nations sought to realize a political restoration, they were led to rest it on a religious restoration in agreement with the Pope, and "when the four great aliled powers, three of them anti-Catholic, met at London to regulate the international situation, one of the first questions they had to consider was the desire expressed by the Pope that he recover the possession of the whole Roman state." [6] As following the fall of the Roman Empire or of Charlemagne's Empire, the papacy remained the great moral power, standing amid the ruins.

---

[4] Letter to Cardinal Fesch, May 27, 1818.

[5] On Napoleon's Christian death, see, in the *Gaulois* of April 6, 1912, or in the *Revue du clergé français* of May 1, 1912, the testimony of Countess Lapeyrouse de Bonfils, daughter of General de Montholon, who received the Emperor's last sign and who closed his eyes.

If we would express in a word the desire of Europe in 1815, we find nothing better than the word "Restoration." As Cardinal Hergenröther wrote, "In the best minds of this period all concern seemed to be determined by a need for restoration." [7] This restoration was first desired in the political order. No one, not even Metternich, who would thenceforth for more than thirty years be the arbiter of Europe, thought of reviving the organization of the old regime. No doubt some intentional exaggeration was to be found in the word spoken at the Congress of Vienna by Cardinal Consalvi: "Between the present times and ancient times I see more differences than between the era following the Deluge and that preceding it." [8] But the Revolution and the Empire had established facts against which any reaction was futile. Statesmen's looks turned less to the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV than to the institutions of constitutional England, which acquired a new prestige from her material prosperity and her recent victories. Following the regime of repression which Emperor Napoleon had exercised over them, the nations aspired to "develop henceforth according to the specific laws of their historic traditions and their ethnic qualities, in relations regulated solely by the reciprocity of their rights and their own aspirations." [9]

---

[6] Ranke, *Histoire de la papauté* (French trans.), III, 372. This desire of the Pope, which Ranke speaks of, was expressed in a letter from Pius VII to the congress of Prague in 1813. Cf. Van Duerm, *Correspondance de Consalvi avec Metternich,* p. v.

[7] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* VIII, Bk. III, Part I, chap. 7.

[8] Quoted by Goyau, "Consalvi au congrès de Vienne," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of September 1, 1906, p. 147. Cf. Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon,* p. 681.

After the disturbances of the Revolution and the wars of the Empire, the restoration of economic life and of public liberties, so long fettered, was also one of the urgent needs. The tendency toward the same goal we see in Russia changing her serfs into workers, and her rich lords into manufacturers; in Prussia seeking the progress of her industry by joining tariff associations; in France replacing her old landed aristocracy with a military aristocracy of the vanished regime. Everywhere the youth, which for a long time had been thrilled at the word "glory," now was enthused at the word "liberty." Says Musset: "A man mounted the speakers' platform, holding in his hand an agreement between the king and the people; he started saying that glory is something beautiful, as also warlike ambition; but something more beautiful is liberty. At this word the children raised their heads." [10]

In this enthusiasm for a public life more industrious and more free, some revolutionary elements secretly mingled with the lawful claims. In Poland and Italy these claims aimed more and more especially at winning an individual nationality, in Germany the attainment of unity, in England an electoral reform, in France the acquisition of a national charter. But secret societies having their origin under the Empire, to some extent everywhere, for the purpose or on the pretext of resisting oppression, were carrying on their underground work after the re-establishment of peace. Of these societies the typical one was the Carbonari. This society, originating in Calabria under the government of Murat, was at first directed against foreign rule but soon affiliated with Freemasonry, from which it took its principal rites. The Carbonari would spread from Italy into Austria and France, where Saint-Simonianism developed steady relations with them.[11]

---

[9] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *ibid.*

[10] Alfred de Musset, *Confession d'un enfant du siècle,* chap. 2, p. 6.

The statesmen who met at the Congress of Vienna (September 22, 1814) had thus no small task before them. We are not here called upon to recount their political work, the sudden interruption of the Congress (March 11, 1815) at news of the return of Bonaparte and his march on Paris, the flight of King Louis XVIII, the Hundred Days, the catastrophe of Waterloo, then the second and final abdication of Napoleon and his exile to St. Helena, where he arrived on October 15, 1815. When Murat, taking advantage of this revolution, invaded Rome, Pius VII, following the dictates of prudence, left the Eternal City and temporarily withdrew to Genoa, but without being frightened over the future. To Jancourt, the French ambassador, he said: "Have no fear; this storm will not last three months."[12]

When the storm had passed, the Congress of Vienna again took up its labors. Consalvi, who appears as the superior diplomat even in the face of Talleyrand and Metternich, step by step argued with his colleagues for the integrity of the Papal States, which were restored to the pope, including the three legations and the principalities of Benevento and Ponte Corvo.[13]

But the rulers and the diplomats who discussed so many high political problems were too well informed to close their eyes to a truth that had struck Napoleon Bonaparte at the close of the Revolution. Evidence for this truth had since then continued to increase: that no political or social restoration could be firmly organized without the help of religion. This conviction at first inspired him with the idea of the Holy Alliance, then, after the failure of this first attempt, with the more practical thought of an entente between the rulers and the Holy Father. That entente was brought about by a series of concordats, most of them in imitation of the French concordat of 1801.

---

[11] On the origin and development of the Carbonari, see Cantu, *Histoire de cent ans (1750–1850)*, II, 430–34.

[12] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VII*, p. 123.

[13] Cf. the important work of Father Rinieri, *Della diplomazia nel secolo XIX*, Vol. IV: *Il congresso di Vienna e la santa Sede;* Vol. V: *Corrispondenza inedita dei cardinali Consalvi e Pacca nel tempo del congresso di Vienna.* Van Duerm, *Correspondance de Consalvi et de Metternich.* Historians had credited the good will of Russia and Prussia with the re-establishment of Pius VII in his states. Father Rinieri's work shows decisively that Consalvi's chief auxiliary was Metternich.

The Holy Alliance

In February 1816, a diplomatic treaty was promulgated having a basis and form in singular contrast to all the acts of this sort generally known. The signatories of this treaty were Emperor Alexander I of Russia, King Ferdinand William III of Prussia, and Emperor Francis I of Austria, to whom were soon added all the kings of Europe except those of England and Saxony. They declared that, "being intimately convinced that the powers must base their advance on the sublime truths taught us by the eternal religion of God the Savior, they proclaimed before the whole world their unshakable determination to take as the rule of their conduct only the precepts of that holy religion, precepts of justice, charity, and peace." Henceforth, conformably with the words of Holy Scripture, they would regard one another as brothers and compatriots, would remain "united by bonds of a true and indissoluble brotherhood," and would offer one another "on every occasion and in all places, assistance, aid, and succor." Ever since at Mersen, in 847, the sons of Louis the Pious, concerned with the safety of their common realm, had solemnly proclaimed "the need of living in concord and union, as wished by the order of God and true brotherhood," such language had never again been spoken by kings.

The publication of this document, soon famous as the Treaty of the Holy Alliance, produced a profound feeling. While some hailed it as the dawn of an immense and favorable Christian rebirth, others cursed it as the announcement of an era of slavery for the peoples. The Treaty of the Holy Alliance deserved neither that enthusiasm nor those curses. Evidently the first idea of it came from the King of Prussia in 1813 after the Battle of Bautzen; but it was the personal work of Emperor Alexander, suggested by an enthusiastic woman, Baroness von Krüdner.

Born at Riga on the shores of the Baltic in 1766, the same year as saw the birth of Madame de Staël, she had an impressionable and mystical nature which was at first nourished by the writings of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and Swedenborg. Afterward she mingled in the high society of Europe at the time when the tragical scenes of the Revolution and the threatening wars of the Empire were upsetting the nations. This woman, Juliana von Wietinghoff, Baroness von Krüdner, was one of those souls whose sensibility vibrated at the shock of all the events they lived through and whose imagination at once transposed the impressions into grandiose visions, into gigantic projects. At the beginning of 1815, while she was in Switzerland, some circumstance brought her into the presence of Emperor Alexander I, whose enthusiastic and visionary nature was prone to accept the strangest missions. That which Baroness von Krüdner pointed out to him consisted in nothing less than the regeneration of the world. "The black angel," whom Providence had recently banished to an island of the Ocean, would be succeeded by "the white angel," the "universal Savior," coming, as she said, "from the countries of Aquilon" (the North Wind). Presently she became the confidante of the Russian Emperor, his Egeria. The text of the famous treaty, which we have set forth in general terms, was drawn up in final form (September 26, 1815) only after it had been carefully compared with that which was its first inspiration.

This mystical pact was endorsed by Prince Metternich, who became its earnest defender because he probably saw in it the means of bolstering his monarchical policy. In spite of this noteworthy support, it soon languished, then broke completely. The English non-intervention policy, then that of Eastern Russia, the policy of England and France in favor of Greece, were its manifest contradiction. These religious flights of fancy, which did not venture to name the Church of Christ, with the idea that all beliefs could therein fraternize together, was unable to result in anything practical or to hold any of the contracting parties in a union where the bond was so vague. The Holy Alliance, under its ill-defined form, "was merely the proclamation, from the heart of the political tempest, of that disease of the nullity of faith, of modern indifference and wretchedness, which, with more or less authority and illusion, would in various ways be explored by de Maistre, Saint-Simon, Ballanche, Fourier, and Lamennais." [14]

Far better inspiration had prompted those German princes who, at the beginning of the century, strove to solve the religious question by concordats imitating that which the Pope concluded with Napoleon. In 1803 a certain ecclesiastic, devoted to the Febronian doctrines, made advances in this direction to Pius VII, in the name of Bavaria. The next year a rumor was current in the chanceries that Emperor Francis II was studying a concordat project for the whole Empire. In 1806 the nuncio (della Genga) at Ratisbon discussed the respective advantages of a concordat of the whole Empire or of a series of individual concordats. Napoleon pretended, of his own accord, to regulate the question by an imperial concordat that would consolidate his formation of a confederation of the Rhine. But this project encountered the preferences of the German rulers, naturally in favor of particular concordats for their states. This conflict indefinitely prolonged the conferences.

---

[14] Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits de femmes, Madame de Krüdner,* p. 404.

The imprisonment of the Pope rendered their continuation useless. But the fall of the Empire permitted their resumption in 1815; from that time, not only Germany but all the Catholic nations, one after the other, took up the religious policy of the concordats.[15]

We note a strange fact. Following Napoleon's fall, the first nation with which Rome negotiated a concordat was a non-Catholic one, the nation from which, since the sixteenth century, the Church had suffered the bloodiest persecutions, the country of Henry VIII, Elizabeth, and Cromwell.

The political combinations, by which His Britannic Majesty was made the chief adversary of Napoleon, made him also the defender of the rights of the pope. The King of England was the one who supported the demands of the Holy See when Pius VII presented claims to the works of art that had been taken off to Paris. We are told that George III spent 200,000 francs to have these masterpieces transported to Rome and have them again set up there. When, before the opening of the Congress of Vienna (March, 1814), Cardinal Consalvi came to London, where the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Russia then were, with a view to assuring the Holy See of the backing of the sovereigns, he there received a most friendly welcome on the part of the people, as likewise from the prime minister, Lord Castlereagh, and even from the King himself.[16] The accomplished diplomat profited by this circumstance. Not satisfied with treating the question of the full restoration of the papal domain, he broached the question of the rights of English Catholics.

We know that, ever since the reign of Elizabeth, all relations between Great Britain and Rome were severed. The Statute of Praemunire provided that any person who would receive from Rome any document whatever should be guilty of high treason. This article had never been abrogated. On the contrary, it was applied in 1792 under circumstances emphasizing its gravity. When Pius VII wrote to the King of England to thank him for the hospitality extended to the French clergy in his states, the prelate charged with carrying the papal document was notified, upon his arrival, that, according to existing laws, he could not be received. The oath of allegiance (abjuration of belief in the transubstantiation and the recognition of the supremacy of the king in the Church) was always required of all who wished to enter the military or civil service, or to sit in Parliament.

---

[15] On the history of these first negotiations of Germany, see Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* I, 107–11.

[16] Viscount de Richemond, "A la veille du congrès de Vienne," in the *Correspondant* of September 25, 1905, p. 1114.

Two facts, however, had weakened the prejudice of the English people against what they called "the papist superstition." Eight thousand French ecclesiastics, proscribed by the Revolution and generously welcomed on English territory, had there won the high regard of their hosts. Besides, the novels of Walter Scott accustomed the English imagination to sympathize with Catholic personages, and the writings of Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey had accomplished in England a work like that of Chateaubriand in France and of Goerres in Germany.

After Waterloo, English thought, now freed from the gigantic efforts that had absorbed it during the struggle against Napoleon, gave more attention to the religious problems. Matured by the tremendous crisis they had just passed through, rulers and subjects turned to Christianity there to find a doctrine of peace and of life, rather than an occasion of strife against Rome.

In these dispositions of mind the conference began at London between Consalvi and Lord Castlereagh. The minister at the outset clearly declared "that he could not think of requiring from the Catholics anything beyond what their principles allowed." For the abrogation of the penal laws against Catholics and the full emancipation of Catholics, he prefaced three conditions: 1. the taking of an oath of fidelity to the Constitution; 2. the intervention of the government in the nomination of bishops, either by a veto or by some other form to be considered; 3. the submitting of all documents coming from Rome to the royal exequatur. The Holy Father, to whom Consalvi referred the question, replied: 1. that he judged legitimate the oath of fidelity and that he gladly would accept the formula inserted in the French concordat or any analogous formula; 2. that the question of the nomination of bishops involved more serious considerations, because the Roman pontiffs had never granted the requested right to any sovereign belonging to another communion, but that the Holy Father, without compromising the basic principle, could heartily accept certain conciliatory forms; 3. lastly, the Pope declared that he could in no wise accept the royal exequatur for all rescripts of the Holy See. This point touched the very life of the Church, whose spiritual independence the pope must maintain at all costs.

This reply of Pius VII was evidence of his disinterestedness. "His opposition to the wishes of the English cabinet might lose at Vienna a support on which he was basing valuable hope, but he did not hesitate thus to risk his temporal power in order to safeguard the spiritual interests of the Church." [17]

Such were the foundations on which Consalvi was authorized to negotiate with the prime minister of England. Circumstances prevented the two diplomats, while they were at Vienna, from concluding the project. As remarked appositely by the historian who was the first to make public the history of this interesting attempt, "in this realm of ideas, failures are not so much defeats as they are steps preceding the victory, and every sincere effort brings the hour nearer." [18] Before Consalvi left

---

[17] Viscount de Richemond, "Un essai de Concordat entre l'Angleterre et le Saint-Siège," in the *Correspondant* of October 10, 1905, p. 76.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

Rome, Castlereagh in words of praise declared that "the cardinal's conduct gave an exact notion of what the clergy of the Roman court really is." In the course of the conferences he had proposed an exchange of diplomatic envoys between the king of England and the pope.[19] Four years later King George III accredited a minister to the Holy See. In the sequel formidable obstacles would arise against the proposed diplomatic entente and against the movement of individual conversions to Catholicism; but the advance toward Rome had begun.

The Church in France

Quite different was the situation in France. King Louis XVIII (June 4, 1814) granted a charter, in its political portion imitating the English Constitution, but declaring the Catholic religion the religion of the state. Other legislative acts soon emphasized the clearly Catholic policy of the Restoration. Before the Hundred Days, an ordinance (March 2, 1815) re-established the Foreign Mission Seminary and the seminaries of the Holy Ghost. The Jesuits, without being the object of a special authorization, returned, relying on the guaranties which the charter contained about liberty. The "Chambre introuvable" abolished the divorce law; the bishops obtained partial direction and supervision over the educational establishments, and the observance of Sundays and feast days was prescribed by law.

But Pius VII soon perceived that this protective policy would not lack a hidden hostility to his personal authority, a hostility which showed itself both in the government and in some of the upper clergy of France.

We recall that, when in 1801 the Holy Father called for the resignation of all the bishops, thirty-six members of the episcopal body refused submission to this measure. Death reduced their number to about one-half. But the restoration of the king, whose devoted followers they had remained, strengthened their claims. Gathered round a prelate whose influence constituted their main strength, Talleyrand-Perigord, former archbishop of Reims and a personal friend of King Louis XVIII, they openly bore the title of their see even when this had been suppressed by the new diocesan boundaries in accord with the concordat. They held in disdain those whom they called "the bishops of the concordat" and they recalled that their sovereign, during his exile, had ever protested against the agreement concluded between Pius VII and Bonaparte. The revision of the concordat of 1801, the total removal of the concordat prelates, the re-establishment of all the bishoprics existing in 1789, the appointment of new titulars to the vacant sees according to the regulations of the 1516 concordat: such were their clearly defined demands. An ecclesiastical commission, appointed by the King and instructed to study the question, endorsed all these claims. These demands were sent to the French ambassador at Rome, de Pressigny, the former bishop of Saint-Malo, by the minister of foreign affairs, Prince Talleyrand.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

At Rome, feeling ran high. The Pope appointed, to assist Consalvi, a commission of three cardinals. These replied to the proposals of the French government with the following counterproposals: 1. the bishoprics of 1801 would be maintained along with their titulars; 2. the government would bestow on the clergy a permanent endowment; 3. it would assure the submission of the former bishops who had not resigned. The pretention of the thirty-six bishops to impose their interpretation on the Church, was particularly objectionable to Consalvi. "All the Catholic Churches," he said, "those of Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland, as also the Church of America, have assented to the Holy Father's act and hold communion with the concordat bishops. How, then, can anyone dare to say that the whole

Catholic Church rests in the thirty-six non-resigned bishops, now reduced to ten or twelve in number?" [20]

Long discussions ended in a "Convention of August 25, 1816," by which the concordat of 1516 would be re-established. As for the concordat of 1801, it was neither disavowed nor expressly revoked, but would cease to have its effect. In return, the organic articles were revoked. To obtain this last result was the reason why the Pope consented to abandon the concordat of 1801. Now was the turn of the French ministers to protest. What would happen to "the privileges of the Church of France"? Influenced by the Duke de Richelieu and chiefly by Duke Decazes, Louis XVIII ratified the convention, but with a reservation of "the liberties of the Gallican Church."

In the presence of this unexpected restriction and of fresh intrigues contrived by Talleyrand-Perigord, Decazes, and Richelieu, the Pope refused to ratify the treaty. The agreement of 1816, sometimes called the concordat of 1816, thus became a dead letter, and that of 1801 resumed its full force.[21]

But Louis XVIII and the bishops who followed the inspiration of Talleyrand-Perigord could not resign themselves to remain under the regime of a convention signed by Bonaparte.

Fresh negotiations were then entered upon, which finally ended in the concordat of June 11, 1817. It embraced seventeen articles. The proposals of the Pope were admitted in principle, but with vague restrictions which practically could be eluded when the king judged it well to do so. The bishoprics of 1801 were maintained, along with their titularies, but "saving some particular exceptions founded on serious and legitimate reasons" (arts. 4, 7, 9). An endowment in landed property and in revenue from the state was assured the clergy, but only when "the circumstances would permit it" (art. 8). The King did not explicitly promise to obtain the resignation of the former bishops who had not resigned, but merely "to use all means in his power to remove as soon as possible the obstacles that were opposed to the good of religion and to the execution of the laws of the Church." The ratifications were exchanged without delay and, on July 19, 1817, the Pope published the new concordat by his bull *Ubi primum.*

---

[20] Richemond, "Consalvi à Paris en 1814," in the *Correspondant* of October 25, 1905, p. 253.

[21] For details of the negotiations related above and the full text of the 1816 concordat, see Feret, "Le concordat de 1816 (according to the archives of the ministry of foreign affairs)" in the *Revue des questions historiques,* XXVI (1901), 187–240.

The accord seemed to be final. A constitutional scruple on the King's part made the whole project collapse. Some ministers (Pasquier, Decazes, and Lainé) thought that the concordat should be submitted to the approval of the Chambers. The King joined in this view, which the spirit of the charter seemed to favor. But the time was the very moment when the liberal opposition on one side and the extreme royalists on the other were conducting their most violent campaigns. The *Observations d'un ancien canoniste* by the former Oratorian and *Essai historique sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane* by Grégoire had reawakened the old religious quarrels against Rome. The new concordat, even cleverly made part of a legal project that revised the organic articles, stirred up a formidable opposition by the doctrinaire majority; and Count de Marcellus, in the name of the extreme right, rejected it as an attack on the rights of the Church. The project, introduced into the Chamber on November 22, 1817, was withdrawn by the ministry at the end of the following March. Fresh negotiations, which could merely exasperate, were then carried on between Paris and Rome until the hour when Pius VII, worn out by the variations of the French government and little satisfied with the rest of an agreement which he had signed with reluctance and as a last resort, declared by a *motu proprio* (August 23, 1819) in favor of maintaining provisionally the concordat of 1801. This provisional approval became final. A law of May, 1821, authorized the government to negotiate with Rome, on these bases, the creation of thirty new sees. All the discussions relative to this affair were ended by the publication of the bull *Paternae caritatis* (October 10, 1822), establishing for the dioceses in France a new circumscription, which did not subsequently undergo any important modifications. On November 19 the King of France, finally renouncing any new demand, thanked the Supreme Pontiff "for all that His Holiness had done to assure the prosperity of the Church of France." [22]

Concordats

The failure of the attempted French concordats of 1816 and 1817 was not indeed a matter of regret either for the state or for the Church. The agreement of 1801, in spite of its imperfections, offered a basis of more solid understanding. The Bavarian concordat of June 5, 1817, was drawn up on that model, "copying it almost word for word." [23] The state guaranteed to the Church the exercise of all the rights flowing from her divine constitution and the canonical prescriptions; the Pope granted to the King the right to nominate the bishops, reserving to the Pontiff the instituting of the bishops. The kingdom was divided into two ecclesiastical provinces, with six suffragan sees, and religious corporations were authorized.[24] This treaty might be called the one "most closely approaching purely Catholic maxims." [25] This judgment is true only with regard to the concordat text taken in itself; for the concordat "was almost immediately imperiled by the way the Bavarian government published it. . . . To it was applied 'an edict of religion,' which subordinated the Church to the state. The signature given to the Pope by the King of Bavaria was revised and half withdrawn by the addition of organic articles, which made with the concordat a single block, a hybrid and incoherent charta, which required the oath of ecclesiastics and office holders." [26] After long negotiations, the King of Bavaria in 1821 promised that the concordat of itself would have the force of a law of the state and that the guaranties which it accorded to the Catholic Church could not be diminished or restricted by the stipulations of the edict of religion.[27] The jurists still found occasion to complain of this declaration; but Rome had won much by getting recognition in principle of the intrinsic legislative force of the concordat.[28]

---

[22] See Feret, "Le concordat de 1817," in *Revue des questions historiques* (January, 1902, p. 201). Cf. Sagnac, "Le concordat de 1817," in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* (December, 1905, and March, 1906).

[23] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* I, 140.

[24] For the text of this concordat, see Martens, *Nouveau recueil de traités,* III, 106–26, and Barberi, *Bullarium,* XIV, 314 ff.

[25] Cantu, *Histoire de Cent Ans,* II, 395.

The tireless Consalvi, simultaneously with the onerous labors involved in the affairs of England, France, and Bavaria, carried on diplomatic negotiations with Russia. These resulted (January 18, 1818) in the signing of a concordat, specifying that at Warsaw would be an archbishop and in Poland eight episcopal sees. At the same time was settled the question of fees to be paid for expediting the bulls of institution.[29]

The discussions with King Ferdinand of Naples, who, by a decision of the Congress of Vienna, was made king of the Two Sicilies, were particularly annoying; to reach an accord required all the diplomacy of Consalvi. At first the Pope, in the name of the ancient rights of the papacy, protested against the new title taken by King Ferdinand, who in return refused to recognize in the pope any supremacy beyond that of head of the Church. Consalvi proposed to Medici, the prime minister of Naples, that he should go to Terracina and there treat of the pending difficulties orally. Following these conferences (February 16, 1817), was signed a concordat which, in its first article, proclaimed the Catholic religion as the religion of the kingdom. Those persons in possession of ecclesiastical property that had been sold would not be disturbed; the religious orders would be subject to their superiors general; the bishops could convoke synods and could make a visit *ad limina apostolorum;* and all the faithful would have the right of appeal to the Holy See.[30]

---

[26] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[27] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XV, 120.

[28] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

[29] Artaud, *op. cit.*, IV, 200.

The treaty with Piedmont contained this special item, that the Jesuits were there charged with the education of youth and that an association of secular priests, the Oblates of the Virgin, who made a special vow of obedience to the Holy See, was legally instituted.[31]

The regulation of the status of the religious was also the subject of negotiations undertaken with Switzerland. In 1814 Pius VII had given Switzerland a vicar apostolic. By the terms of the constitutional pact concluded in 1821, Fribourg received the Jesuits within its walls, and the existing religious orders were to be kept. A short time afterwards Pius VII restored the diocese of Basel and entrusted the Catholics of Geneva to the bishop of Lausanne. Shortly before his death (1823) he erected the abbey of St. Gall into an episcopal church and joined it to the bishopric of Chur. All these arrangements, however, had merely a provisional character. The final concordat with Switzerland was not concluded until 1828, under Leo XII, who promulgated it by the bull *Inter praecipua.* The 900,000 Swiss Catholics were thenceforth divided in five dioceses (Basel, Lausanne, Sion, Chur, and Como). St. Gall, made autonomous in 1845, would form a sixth diocese.

To his regret, Pius VII was unable to do anything for the Catholics of the Netherlands, where the stadholder laid a heavy yoke on them. Leo XII in 1827 signed with him a concordat which was not executed. From that time the violent separation of Belgium, three quarters composed of Catholics, seemed inevitable. That separation did, in fact, take place in 1830.

---

[30] Cantu, *op. cit.,* II, 394; Barberi, *op. cit.,* XV, 8–14.

[31] *Ibid.,* p. 395.

In Germany a group of Protestant states remained to be considered, with their million and a half of Catholics, for whom the Pope wished to assure a legal status. First was Prussia, where the descendant of Albert of Brandenburg and of the king-sergeant tried in 1815 to come to an understanding with him whom his two great ancestors called the Antichrist. Frankfort also was the place where a sort of syndicate of Lutheran princes was formed to work out with the Holy See the legal status of the Catholics of Baden, Würtemberg, Hesse, and Nassau.

"The Congress of Vienna, by assuring Prussia of considerable territories along the Rhine valley, had oddly increased the number of Prussia's Catholic subjects, and the Catholic question became from day to day more lively and painful. Frederick William III was aware of this condition. . . . Prussia could no longer present herself before Germany as a power essentially Protestant." [32] The Prussian minister at Rome was then the illustrious historian Berthold Niebuhr. For this zealous Protestant,

> the religion and practices of the Roman Church were displeasing, but his dislike of the papist religion did not degenerate into intolerance and, once he came to know Pius VII and Consalvi, he was almost won by these two men. In the Vatican library Pius VII had some fine manuscripts, a charm that appealed to the scholarly minister of Prussia: it paid honor to this pope who gave the minister access to the hidden records of the past. The conversation between the two men passed gently to matters of the Church. Niebuhr listened to the desires of the aged pontiff and found them just, even moderate. . . . When the patient labors of Niebuhr had advanced the question sufficiently, Chancellor Hardenberg himself came to Rome to give himself the easy honor of reaping the fruit. The result was the bull *De salute animarum* (July 17, 1821).[33] This bull extended to the whole kingdom of Prus-

---

[32] Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 144.

[33] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XV, 403.

sia; it adjusted the old Prussian provinces to the diocesan divisions. By this bull archbishoprics and bishoprics were given boundaries such as they still are.[34]

The nomination of bishops was granted to the chapters on this condition, that the candidate should be of Prussian origin. The brief *Quod de fidelium* (July 16, 1821) explained that the fact that the candidate was German would suffice.[35]

With regard to the group of Protestant states that, by an ecclesiastical commission, was preparing at Frankfort a project of entente with Rome, they began by clashing sharply with Cardinal Consalvi.

The sovereigns who let their Febronian advisers whisper to them that a day would come when the pope, fallen from his primacy, would be brought back to his function of preacher, requested the Vatican to mark on a map the new ecclesiastical boundaries and then leave them in peace. The Pope refused to be simply a surveyor and to sacrifice implicitly his prerogative as spiritual head of the Church. However, such were the distress of souls and the anarchy of the clergy that, to put as promptly as possible a little order in this chaos, a provisional agreement was signed in 1821. Rome created four bishoprics and an archbishopric, and the governments promised endowments for these revived Churches. But scarcely had these outlines been traced, when the lay powers, eager to dismiss the Holy See, which they thought they no longer needed, drew forth from their files two documents, one called "The Instrument of Foundation," the other "The Pragmatic of the Church." The five ecclesiastics whom they thought of making bishops, were put under the necessity of adhering to these documents. Four of the five agreed to do so. But in these acts Febronius fully revived.[36]

Rome protested. Baden invoked the help of Austria. To avoid any misunderstanding, the Pope required explicitly the freedom of the episcopal jurisdiction in place of the lay dominance. The powers published this bull, declaring its acceptance but adding "that no one may deduce therefrom anything that can be contrary to their rights of sovereignty." The discussions continued without either Rome or the states being willing to withdraw any of their demands. Formidable conflicts were foreseen as likely to arise in the matter of interpreting the papal bull and the postscript which the sovereigns wished to have added. But the Catholics were armed; they would enter the strife, defending themselves with the arms furnished them by the pope; they would protest and would enter these protests in the diplomatic papers.

---

[34] Goyau, *op. cit.,* I, 145.

[35] Since 1841, in Prussia, the king was presented with a list of candidates from which he rejected the names that did not please him, with the condition that he leave on the list at least three names.

[36] Goyau, *op. cit.,* I, 151.

The concern felt by the common father of the faithful over the situation of the Catholics in the old nations of Europe could not make him unmindful of the young Church of America. In 1808 Pius VII created the province of Baltimore with four suffragan sees (New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown). But in these new lands where the growth of Catholicity gave bright prospects, two dangers had to be averted. Under the influence of a revolutionary spirit and undoubtedly also by the close proximity of the Protestants, lay boards, encouraged by a few thoughtless or turbulent priests, assumed the full administration of Church property and thereby virtually of the direction of the parishes. They even pretended to have the right to choose their pastors without the approval of the bishop and even contrary to his wishes. Pius VII's brief *Non sine magno* condemned these assumptions.[37] An equally serious danger appeared on the horizon: the strange interference in the affairs of the American Church, mainly in the nomination of the bishops. Archbishop Marechal of Baltimore obtained from the Supreme Pontiff a brief granting exclusively to the American bishops the right of presenting the names of candidates to the episcopal office. This decision, by freeing the American

---

[37] Viscount de Meaux, *L'Eglise et la liberté aux Etats-Unis,* pp. 273–91.

Church from the unwarranted control which some European states attempted to exercise over it, resulted in a stronger attachment of the clergy of the United States to the See of Rome, and at the same time to their own country.[38]

The Papal States

So many delicate negotiations would have been impossible except for the prodigious activity of him whom his contemporaries called "the great cardinal." For a quarter of a century Cardinal Hercules Consalvi was a moral force that had to be reckoned with in Europe. Confronted with Bonaparte in 1801, with Metternich and Talleyrand in 1815, he had obtained these two notable victories: the French concordat and the restoration of the Papal States to the Holy See. But his solicitude neglected nothing that could concern religion in any part of the world.

External affairs did not absorb him completely. After his triumphs at Paris, London, and Vienna, he gave attention to the care of the internal administration of the states of the pope. His administrative and judiciary reforms deserve particular attention. We know that Napoleon introduced the French civil code at Rome. Many clauses of the old law of the ancient Roman regime were outworn, but the sudden introduction of a new legal code brought on numerous troubles. Consalvi knew how, according to the words of a historian, "to establish a just equilibrium between the old juridical institutions and the new code brought in by the French."[39] He repressed the boldness of the feudal barons, who were profiting by the reaction of 1815 to invoke privileges of another age and who accepted from the French law only the provisions that experience showed were useful. He ratified the sale of Church property, but he was watchful to have returned to their former destinations, by money compensations, the episcopal residences and the monasteries needed by the religious. Perhaps his masterpiece was that commercial code, which Guizot calls "a monument of wisdom." Nor did the eminent Secretary of State neglect the protection of the fine arts. In his veneration for the grandeur of Rome, he strove to embellish its monuments and repair its ruins. To him is owing the achievement of the celebrated promenade of the Pincio. At his request, the Pope created two new chairs of archaeology and of natural history at the Sapienza and called the learned Cardinal Angelo Mai to the Vatican library. He ordered some manuscripts that enriched the treasury of Rome's antiquities and, to the end of his life, he was the friend and protector of Canova.

---

[38] G. André, in *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1057.

[39] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* VIII, Part II, Bk. III, chap. 7.

Besides, Consalvi was the most obliging of friends, the most charming talker in informal conversations. But what most fittingly should be held about him, is that this prince of the Church, who merits a place among the foremost statesmen, in the calculations of a worldly policy or in the charms of worldly dealings never lowered the ideal of his ministry and the majesty of the Church he represented. Napoleon, a man who was a good judge of men and who had seen the cardinal yield to no one in the most complex political questions and in the observance of the nicest rules of court etiquette, said of him: "Consalvi has not the air of a priest, but he is really one of the most priestly men I have known."

Relying on this able and faithful adviser, Pius VII, in his advanced age, worked to promote, in the center of Christianity, that religious restoration which he had encouraged in the rest of the world.

After his great struggles with the Empire, the first of his cares was the reconstitution of the religious orders and their centralization in Rome. By his bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* (August 7, 1814) [40] he officially reconstituted the

---

[40] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XIII, 323–25.

Society of Jesus, which had already founded several communities in the Papal States, Sardinia, Naples, England, Switzerland, France, and America; and when in 1815 the Jesuits were driven out of Moscow and St. Petersburg, then in 1819 out of all Russia, he favored their establishment in Austria. Pius VII showed particular benevolence toward the Academy of the Catholic Religion founded in Rome (1800) by Archbishop Coppoli of Myra. He also reopened the English, Scotch, and Germanic seminaries, and reorganized the Propaganda. Several sovereigns paid visits to him at Rome: Emperor Francis I came in the spring of 1819, with a large and brilliant suite; King Frederick William III of Prussia came in 1822. Pius VII during his last years had the joy of seeing five new countries (Russia, Prussia, The Netherlands, Hanover, and Würtemberg) establish diplomatic representatives accredited to the Holy See. At the same time he was grieved to note the developments taken by the sect of the Carbonari and he condemned this society by a special bull (September 13, 1821).[41]

On July 7, 1823, the fourteenth anniversary of the day when he was suddenly snatched away from Rome, the Pope, already much enfeebled by age, suffered a fall which involved a fracture of the leg. The consequences of this fall seemed serious to the physicians in attendance on the Pope. In the evening of August 20 he expired while praying to God and uttering a few vague words, in which "Savona" and "Fontainebleau" could be made out. He was ninety-one years old and had reigned twenty-three years, five months, and six days. During this long pontificate, marked by a few outstanding joys and by inexpressible griefs, he had tried to heal the nations of the wounds inflicted on them by the antireligious Revolution; and almost everywhere, before his death, he had the consolation of seeing, in spite of the numerous efforts of the anti-Christian sects, some germs of Catholic restoration.

[41] *Ibid.*, XV, 446.

CHAPTER XI

The Religious Movement

WHATEVER the importance of the political events we have just been considering, whatever the genius or holiness of the men who were the chief actors, neither the greatness of those events nor the value of those men could of themselves account for the movement of religious restoration that occurred after the Revolution. That movement had its principal source in a work of interior renovation which took place in the depth of souls and which we find expressed in the writers of the period.

The most eminent of these writers, Chateaubriand, said about his work, in the pompous tone customary with him: "Napoleon would not have been what he was if the Muse had not been there: reason carried out the ideas of the poet." In fact, the poet, like the lawmaker, "far from suddenly transforming public opinion, owed his very success to what that opinion had already more or less secretly changed." [1] We have already pointed out the main causes of the change. Chateaubriand himself, speaking of a different period, which bore a certain likeness to his own, wrote:

> When the dust rising from the wreck of so many monuments settled down, when death silenced the groans of so many victims, when the noise from the fall of the colossus ceased, then a cross was seen, and at the foot of this cross a new world. A few priests, carrying the Gospel and seated on these ruins, raised up society amid the tombs, as Jesus Christ brought back to life the children of those who believed in Him.[2]

---

[1] Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française,* p. 883.

[2] Chateaubriand, *Etudes historiques,* at the end of the discourse on the fall of the Roman Empire.

These lines refer to the fall of the Roman Empire. The best informed masters of historical criticism, without using this glowing language, say the same thing.[3] Following the Revolution--Chateaubriand is still speaking—"how many families torn asunder had to seek from the common Father of men the children they had lost! How many broken hearts, how many solitary souls called upon a divine hand to cure them! The victims of our distresses were saved at the altar, as shipwrecked persons cling to the rock on which they hope for safety."[4] Poets, artists, and philosophers, from Chateaubriand to La Mennais, from Overbeck to Goerres, from Walter Scott to Pusey, became the more or less faithful echo of this awakening of religious faith which had its three chief centers in France, Germany, and England.

Chateaubriand

On the very day (April 18, 1802) when a solemn *Te Deum* was sung at Notre Dame in Paris to celebrate the conclusion of the concordat, the *Moniteur* published an article by Fontanes on the *Génie du christianisme,* which appeared four days before. The author was that young Viscount Chateaubriand whose name we have already met several times. When an *émigré* in England he had there published (1797) a curious work, the *Essai sur les révolutions.* According to his own declaration, its essential idea was that "nothing is new under the sun and that we find in ancient and modern revolutions the personages and the principal traits of the French Revolution."[5] In this work of his youth, a work of doubt rather than of real negation, some pages evidently inspired by the doctrines of the *Encyclopedia* were to be found beside pages that have a thoroughly religious inspiration.[6] A year later the author of the *Essai,* upon learning of his mother's death, felt a sudden change take place in him. He wrote: "I wept, and I believed." "From the crisis brought on by this death," says Brunetière, "he emerged a changed man. The thought of his *Génie du christianisme* was born from the depth of his grief." The aim of this work was to show, contrary to what was taught by the *Encyclopedia* and by the *Essai sur les mœurs,* that

---

[3] Mommsen and Marquard, *Manuel des institutions romaines,* XII, 89; G. Boissier, *La religion romaine, la fin du paganisme,* preface of 1826.

[4] Chateaubriand, *Génie du christianisme,* preface of 1826.

[5] Preface of 1826 in *Œovres de Chateaubriand* (1853), XIII, 9.

> of all religions (and we might say: of all doctrines of morality) that ever existed, the Christian religion is the most poetic, the most human, the most favorable to liberty, to the arts and letters; that the modern world owes everything to it; that nothing is more divine, nothing more amiable and more stately than its dogmas, its doctrine, and its worship; that it favors genius, purifies taste, develops the virtuous passions, gives vigor to thought, offers noble forms to the writer and perfect models to the artist.[7]

The original edition, in five octavo volumes (4,000 copies), was exhausted in a few months. "This newcomer spoke a language with new breadth, harmony, and majesty. Imagine the eloquence of Rousseau, the coloring of Bervordin, the winning sweetness and laguid charms of Fenelon poured together." [8]

The literary quality of the *Génie du christianisme* was of the highest and its apologetic value was real. The latter has often been misjudged from a failure to consider its special point of view.

At the origin of the stream of unbelief that corrupted the last years of the old regime and vitiated the whole Revolution, we have noted two main sources: the ruinous irony of Voltaire and the sentimental utopia of Rousseau. The *Génie du christianisme* silenced Voltaire's laughter and turned Rousseau's sentimentalism toward the Catholic religion. By showing that Catholicism is something beautiful and that we should admire it, he prepared the way for those who would demonstrate that it is true and should be believed. Thus the new apologist simply applied the apologetic method used by Pascal: "To show that religion is venerable, to pay it respect; then to present it as something likeable; to make good men wish that it were true; and then to show that it is true." [9] Voltaire had expended much wit in his desire to show that the Sacred Books, even if not apocryphal or corrupted or deceitful, were immoral, absurd, and ridiculous. Chateaubriand, proudly comparing the Bible with the poems of Homer, showed in the Holy Scripture not only the loftiest moral teaching, the most sublime views on the origin of the world and its destinies, but also the noblest, simplest, and most varied and sublimest style that men ever heard.[10] Jean Jacques Rousseau had sung hymns to conscience and had grieved at seeing men accept "so many intermediaries between God and themselves." Chateaubriand set forth the greatness and beauty not only of God and Christ, but of the Church, her priesthood, her sacraments, and her ceremonies. In celebrating the ceremonies of Corpus Christi and the greatness of the sacraments of extreme unction and penance, he employed figures so beautiful and accents so touching, in a language so harmonious, that men's hearts were stirred by them.

---

[6] Chateaubriand later incorporated almost all these latter pages in the *Génie du christianisme.*

[7] *Génie du christianisme* (1854 ed.), p. 7.

[8] Victor Giraud, *Pages choisies de Chateaubriand,* p. 84.

In truth, anyone may rightly note what makes such an apologetic incomplete and, in certain regards, suspect: "a diffuse plan with no philosophy; a style often pompous; an abuse of antitheses and drawn-out contrasts; empty and high-sounding phrases; perpetual confusion of the marvelous with the supernatural; gaps and sophisms."[11] Such defects, we must grant, contributed to the success of this book no less than did its qualities. Its influence was far greater than it deserved. The book was less the work of a man than the work of a situation. This dazzling charmer, who wished to lead the world back to the religion of the past, entered so well into the prejudices of the men of his time and so wonderfully grasped their aspirations, tastes, and attachments!

---

[9] Pascal, *Pensées* (3rd ed.), p. 414. People endlessly discussed "the religion of Chateaubriand." The true solution of all the difficulties is found in this declaration by himself: "My whole life has been tossed between doubt and faith." We must unhappily recognize that these alternatives presented themselves at the very moment when Chateaubriand was writing his *Génie du christianisme,* or at least that his faith was not then strong enough to inspire him with conduct conformable to his beliefs.

[10] *Génie du christianisme,* Part II, Bk. V.

On the closing pages of the *Génie du christianisme* we read:

> To investigate the influence of Christianity on laws and governments, as we have done for morals and poetry, would be the subject of a fine work. We merely point out the way. . . . Montesquieu has well demonstrated that Christianity is, by its spirit and its admonitions, opposed to arbitrary power. . . . Do not some Christian republics exist that seem to be more attached to their religion than the monarchies are? . . . The representative system springs partly from ecclesiastical institutions. Of these the Church offers the first model in her councils. . . . Christianity is especially admirable for having converted "the physical man" into "the moral man." . . . The precepts of the Gospel form the real citizen.[12]

In an important page of his preface for a new edition of the *Essai sur les révolutions,* Chateaubriand returned to these ideas. "I will not become an unbeliever until someone proves to me that Christianity is incompatible with liberty. . . . For me Christianity bears two proofs of its heavenly origin: by its moral teaching, it tends to free us from the passions; by its political influence, it abolished slavery. It is, then, a religion of freedom; it is mine."

These lines gave a forecast of the whole political and social movement that would fill the first half of the nineteenth century; the ideas and fancies that would stir the thoughts of La Mennais and Saint-Simon are therein already vaguely sketched;

[11] Léon Gautier, *Portraits littéraires,* p. 5.

[12] *Génie du christianisme,* Part IV, Bk. VI, chaps. 10, 11.

and we are not surprised to read in the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe:* "Since the *Génie du christianisme* was not yet written, I would conceive it quite differently. . . . I would show that Christianity is the thought of the future and of human freedom . . . because it places, beside equality, the need of duty, the corrective and regulator of the democratic instinct." [13]

Joseph de Maistre

In the field of religious restoration considered from the political and social point of view, Chateaubriand was not the only Catholic whose voice was raised. When the *Génie du christianisme,* in its final chapters, was outlining an apologetic based on the adaptation of the doctrines of Christianity to the constitutional and democratic aspirations of the time, two religious writers had viewed the problem from an altogether opposite angle. If we had wished to conform to the succession of the works rather than the succession of the influences, we would have spoken of Joseph de Maistre and Viscount Bonald before mentioning Chateaubriand.

Six years before the appearance of the *Génie du christianisme* in 1796, and almost simultaneously, Joseph de Maistre brought out at Lausanne his *Considérations sur la France,* and

---

[13] *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* II, 200. We know the strange fancy that Chateaubriand placed in the last book of his *Mémoires d'outre-tombe:* "If I had been tutor of the young prince (the future Henry V), I would have striven to win his confidence. When he should recover his crown, I would have advised him to wear it only with the idea of removing it at the proper time. A beautiful and illustrious day that would be when, after raising up religion, perfecting the constitution of the state, and enlarging the rights of the citizens . . . my pupil would say to the nation solemnly convoked: Frenchmen, your education is finished along with mine. . . . I step down from the throne while freeing you from your oaths to the monarchy. Compare this end with that which the decrepit sons of Henry IV would manifest, obstinately clinging to a throne submerged in the democracy." On Chateaubriand's democratic ideas, see Charles Maurras, *Trois idées politiques: Chateaubriand, Michelet, Sainte-Beuve:* anarchy, democracy, organized imperialism (1912). Cf. Jules Lemaitre, *Chateaubriand,* 1912.

Bonald published at Constance his *Théorie du pouvoir civil et religieux*. But these two works, written specially for the philosophers and the statesmen, exercised their influence rather slowly; Chateaubriand's work, literary and dramatic, combining all literary forms and tones and at the same time providing precepts and models, easily surpassed them. After a while, however, the philosophical works of the two thinkers won equal public recognition. "Chateaubriand was from Brittany, Joseph de Maistre from Savoy, Louis de Bonald from Auvergne. The different provinces of France (Savoy being then French in speech and spirit) seemed to contribute to the work of renovation. All three belonged to the nobility. The frivolous aristocrats of the eighteenth century had shaken off the Christian ideas. After Viscount Chateaubriand, came Count de Maistre and Viscount Bonald, like valiant knights, to fight for the old faith."[14] By their methods and by their doctrines, Joseph de Maistre and Louis de Bonald are sharply distinct from Chateaubriand.

The method of de Maistre, as Auguste Comte remarks,[15] was essentially a positive method. No one succeeded better in showing the practical and effective advantages of religious doctrines and institutions.[16] In his book of *Considerations* which appeared in 1796, as in that of *The Pope* (1819) and in the *Soirées de Saint-Petersbourg* (1821, after his death), his purpose was nothing less than to show in the truths of religion certain social truths, or, as he said, "laws of the world." On this point his style, given to paradox and exaggerations, seems to embody formulas which a sound orthodoxy, careful to defend the autonomy of the supernatural, could not admit. "Theological truths," he wrote, "are merely general truths, manifested and divinized in the religious order, in such a way that no one can attack one of them without attacking a law of the world." But what is this higher law of the world, to which everything is bound? It is chiefly that "man, as a being both moral and corrupted, must necessarily be governed." Hence, when the Revolution attempted to establish or regulate authority by popular vote, it produced a work "radically evil," "Satanic in its essence"; [17] for "it is a truth as certain in its realm as a mathematical proposition, and no great institution results from a deliberation." [18] Even the infallibility of the Church is merely the application "of the right common to all possible sovereignties." [19]

---

[14] Léon Ollé-Laprune, *La vitalité chrétienne,* p. 13.

[15] *Politique positive,* Vol. IV, appendix.

[16] C. Calippe, *L'attitude sociale des catholiques français au XIX^e siècle,* I, 41.

Such are the maxims which Joseph de Maistre professed, affirmed, and proclaimed, "facing the prejudices, vexing the contrary passions, and shattering resistance: haughty, biting, merciless, sententious as Montesquieu and sarcastic as Voltaire." [20] But though we must acknowledge that not all the doctrines of the Savoy philosopher can be admitted unreservedly, two merits cannot be denied him: no one better than he showed the hollowness and danger of the utopias found in Rousseau and, on the other hand, no one better showed to the readers of Voltaire what human truth is contained in Christian dogmas, what social value in Catholicism; and, from these points of view, his apologetic, freed from its excesses of language and doctrine, combined with Chateaubriand's and happily completed it.

Louis de Bonald

Like Joseph de Maistre's theory and that of Chateaubriand, the doctrine of Louis de Bonald is not without exaggeration. In Bonald's case the exaggeration consists in greatly enlarging the influence of tradition at the expense of reason. He was the initiator of that traditionalism which later on the Church had to condemn. But his first plan was good and opportune: to revive in men's minds, disturbed by revolutionary innovations, the idea of tradition. Bonald defends his doctrine with a remarkable sharpness of observation and force of logic. Unfortunately his observation is often too restricted and his logic too rigid. He says: "If man is everywhere born the same, the same political and religious constitution ought to be suitable for all societies." [21] But the constitution which tradition indicated to Bonald as the only possible one is monarchy. Hence he concludes: "Without monarchy, no constitution. A republic is essentially an unorganized state." [22] Moreover, man exists only for society, and society forms him only for itself.[23] Bonald had an absolute confidence in legislation to alter customs. What, then, is the remedy for the greatest corruption? Perfect laws.[24] Joseph de Maistre had never believed that the strife against individualism could authorize such maxims. "Every law," he said, "is useless and even harmful, however excellent it may be in itself, if the nation is not worthy of the law or made for the law."

---

[17] *Considérations sur la France,* chaps. 4, 5.

[18] *Ibid.,* chaps. 6, 7.

[19] J. de Maistre, *Du pape,* chap. 1.

[20] Ollé-Laprune, *op. cit.,* p. 10.

But on one point Bonald deserves to be unreservedly approved. With untiring energy and persistence he proclaimed that in the social organization respect for morality ought to precede solicitude for riches; man before the machine. In his own words, "the duty of a government is to improve men morally as well as physically, rather than to improve machines." [25]

---

[21] *Théorie du pouvoir,* preface.

[22] *Ibid.,* Part I, Bk. I, chaps. 3, 6, 10; *Législation primitive,* Part I, Bk. II, chap. 10.

[23] *Théorie du pouvoir,* Part III, chap. 3; *Législation primitive,* Part III, chap. 5. On these exaggerations of Bonald and his desire to place a monopoly of teaching in the hands of the Jesuits, see Longhaye, *XIX^e^ siècle* (1900), pp. 250–56.

[24] *Législation primitive,* preliminary discourse.

[25] *Obsérvations sur la Révolution française,* sect. 6.

In short, with less brilliance than Chateaubriand, with less sharpness than Joseph de Maistre, Bonald brought his tribute as a thinker to the work of religious restoration. Had he done nothing more than present the great idea of tradition and that of man's dignity, he would merit a place of honor among the French thinkers of the nineteenth century.

The Clergy

The three apologists we have been speaking of were laymen. The Church had not yet seen rise up from the ranks of her clergy a doctor, prepared by Providence, as in times of crisis she always found on her path; and men looked for him who, such as an Athanasius before Arius, a St. Augustine before Pelagius, or a Cajetan before Luther, would demolish the revolutionary idol before the followers of Voltaire and Rousseau.

Since the Revolution holy priests had expended treasures of zeal and knowledge in strengthening the faithful and withstanding the enemies of religion. Several former members of the Society of Jesus, under the provisional name of Fathers of the Faith and Fathers of the Sacred Heart, had preached missions and founded colleges.[26] The history of the Church ought to commemorate the names of these brave apostles: Fathers de Clorivière, Varin, Tournely, Delpuits. This last named on February 2, 1801 (feast of the Purification) in his lowly room as a religious, with six students of law and of medicine, reconstituted a pious association, founded formerly in 1760 under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin. Lacordaire, speaking of Father Delpuits, said: "Others have acquired more glory in their relations with the youth of France, but none has greater claim to such glory." The society restored by the holy religious was none other than that celebrated Congregation which a hateful legend called a permanent conspiracy but which in fact was especially an association of pure and genuine piety, a center of charitable works. Future priests, such as Paul Teysseyrre, future bishops, such as Charles de Forbin-Janson, future teachers of science, such as René Laennec and Augustin Cauchy, were there trained in solid devotion and apostolic zeal.[27] The Society of the Missionaries of France, founded at Lyons in 1808 by Father Rauzan, had preached the gospel in cities and country districts.[28] At the beginning of the century, in a chapel of the church of St. Sulpice, Frayssinous taught youth the fundamentals and first truths of the faith.[29] La Luzerne and Combalot[30] had stirred the people with their preaching. Archbishop Aviau of Bordeaux[31] and Bishop de Miollis of Digne gave a most edifying example of virtue. The Sulpician, Father Boyer, reanimated the zeal of the clergy by his pastoral retreats, preached in all the dioceses of France. The priests of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, known as Picpus Fathers, founded by Father Condrin in 1801 at Poitiers,[32] and the Basilians, instituted at Annonay in 1801 by a country pastor, Father Lapierre, devoted themselves to the education of youth. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, incorporated in the University by a decree of November 17, 1808, exercised the apostolate with a devotedness worthy of their founder.[33] On August 5, 1804, Father Liautard, while still a deacon, inaugurated in Paris the establishment destined to render notable service to Christian youth under the name of

---

[26] We know that Alphonse de Lamartine was a student under the Fathers of the Faith at Belley.

---

[27] See Geoffroy de Grandmaison, *La Congrégation.* The chief works founded by the Congregation or revived by it were the *Société des bonnes études,* the *Refuge des jeunes condamnés,* the *Association de Saint-Joseph,* the *Société des bonnes œuvres,* the *Bibliothèque catholique,* the *Association pour la défense de la religion.*

[28] Delaporte, *Vie de H. Rauzan.*

[29] A. Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature sous la Restauration,* pp. 155–70.

[30] A. Ricard, *Le P. Combalot.*

[31] Lyonnet, *Vie de Mgr d'Aviau.*

[32] Perron, *Vie du P. Condrin.*

[33] Guibert, *Histoire de saint Jean-Baptiste de La Salle,* p. 646.

Stanislas College.[34] Soon after the concordat, a holy priest of Marseilles, Father Allemand, founded in his native city a fine work for youth, which would serve as a model for all similar undertakings.[35] La Trappe and the Chartreuse, reconstituted in 1815 and 1816, opened new retreats for souls drawn to a life of solitude.[36] However, the ruins accumulated by the Revolution were so extensive that the work to be done appeared still a vast undertaking.

From 1800 to 1815 the number of priests was so reduced that only the cities could be cared for; the country districts had to be left unattended. Father Rohrbacher relates that, after his ordination, he was assigned seven parishes to be served by himself alone. During Father Muard's boyhood, in his district only one catechism was available for six parishes. Under the restoration, Bishop Frayssinous stated in 1820 that, "in the Most Christian Kingdom 15,000 places remained vacant owing to lack of priests to fill them." [37]

The Voltarian spirit was still dominant in the intellectual circles and in the official world, even under the restoration. In many souls Chateaubriand's influence stopped with a vague religiosity, and the works of Bonald and Joseph de Maistre, which were too philosophical, appeared to some as pleadings excessively dominated by a political thought. The generation that had reached maturity was not cured of the rationalist poison, and the tyranny of human respect exercised its sway over the youth. Montalembert wrote:

---

[34] Liautard, *Mémoires,* I, 51.

[35] Gaduel, *Vie et esprit de M. Allemand,* p. 121.

[36] An enumeration of all the congregations founded in France after the concordat would be useless. The list of the principal ones will be found in Baunard's *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* p. 277. Let us note the *Petits Frères de Marie* (Marists), instituted by a priest of Lyons, Father Champagnat; the *Enfants de Marie Immaculée,* better known as Fathers of Chavagnes and the Sisters of Chavagnes, founded by Father Baudouin in the Vendée; the *Frères de la société de Marie* (Marianists), founded at Bordeaux by canon Chaminade; the *Fathers of the Sacred Heart,* established at Lyons in 1822 by Father Frechard, a former Benedictine; the *Frères de l'instruction chrétienne,* known also as *Frères de Ploërruel,* founded in 1819 by Father Jean de La Mennais; and we note especially the progress of the illustrious institute of Madames of the Sacred Heart, begun in 1800 at Paris by Madame Barat.

[37] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* p. 134.

> I can adduce the recollection of all those who, like me, were then ending their education. At that time among us how many were Christian youth, even in the most famous colleges? Scarcely one out of twenty. If we went into a church and there met one of those college students, one of those men who today fill our temples, the meeting produced almost as much surprise and curiosity as the visit of a Christian traveler in a mosque of the Orient.

La Mennais

Such was the state of men's minds when in 1817 a book appeared with the modest title, *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* by Father de La Mennais. The name of this priest was promptly hailed as that of the doctor for whom the Church was waiting.

> A hundred and fourteen years had passed over the tomb of Bossuet, a hundred and three years over that of Fenelon, seventy-six over that of Massillon. . . . After death had silenced those eloquent lips, the Church of France still had distinguished scholars, controversialists, and preachers: no longer did it have names that go far in posterity; and after that time no priest won in France the renown of a writer and lofty personality, when La Mennais appeared, the more timely as the eighteenth century had recently again taken up arms. His book was a remarkable resurrection of the old and eternal reasonings that prove to men the necessity of the faith. . . . It was received with unrestrained enthusiasm and acclaim. In one day La Mennais found himself invested with the might of Bossuet.[38]

These lines are no exaggeration. Father Teysseyrre, when announcing to a friend the proximate appearance of the *Essai*

---

[38] Lacordaire, *Considération sur le système philosophique de M. de La Mennais,* chap. 1. The author of *L'essai sur l'indifférence* did not sign himself Lammenais until 1833.

sur l'indifférence, wrote: "You are going to see a work that unites the style of Jean Jacques Rousseau, the reasoning of Pascal, and the eloquence of Bossuet." [39] When the book came out, Frayssinous declared: "This man has an eloquence fit to raise the dead."

The priest who stirred such enthusiasm was a Breton, as was Chateaubriand, but in his political and religious tendencies he was closer to Joseph de Maistre and Bonald. Reaching to the heart of the question closer than was done by the author of the *Génie du christianisme,* who pointed out particularly the political and moral fitness of the faith, and more penetrating than the author of *Le pape* and the *Législation primitive,* who rather endeavored to discern the social fitness of the faith, the author of the *Essai* invited his readers merely to seek the truth. For, he said, "the most ailing age is not the one that has a passion for error, but the one that neglects and despises the truth." The first part of the *Essai* was devoted to opposing the various forms of indifference: indifference of the statesmen, who merely sought a belief useful to the people; indifference of the eighteenth-century philosophers, who systematically stopped at a so-called natural religion; indifference of the Protestants, who left to each individual the right to make up his own belief. All these forces, he said, end in atheism, because "every religious system based on the exclusion of authority carries atheism in its bosom, and sooner or later will give it birth." [40] The attitude of those who are satisfied with looking only to the social usefulness of religion was an attitude that aroused his indignation especially. He exclaimed: "Can what is greatest and noblest in man be the product of error? . . . Philosophers have less to say about the dignity of man, or else respect it more." The second part was devoted to showing the importance of religion to those who are indifferent through heedlessness or sloth. This second part contained deeply touching passages, with an undying eloquence. In conclusion the author announces that, after destroying one of the foundations of dogmatic indifference, he would prove in the succeeding pages of his work "that a true religion exists, and that for all men it is the unique way of salvation." But first "it is incumbent on us to seek how, in our present condition, we arrive at a certain knowledge of the truth."

---

[39] Paguelle de Follenay, *M. Teysseyrre,* chap. 4.

[40] *Essai,* chap. 6.

This second question, the subject of the second volume (1820),[41] came to be the author's stumbling-block over which he came to grief. The new apologist was ill prepared to take up this difficult question of the foundations of certitude. Felicité de La Mennais, of an impressionable and sickly nature,[42] brought up in the melancholy little town of Saint-Malo, amid the storms of the Revolution, left almost to himself in planning his studies, at first lost his faith after reading the works of the eighteenth-century philosophers, especially of Rousseau. Various circumstances, chief of which we must consider the example of his holy brother Jean-Marie (ordained priest in 1801), led him to the belief and practice of religion. He thought he ought to go farther and follow his brother in the priesthood. From 1809 to 1816, without passing through the regime of the seminary, he received holy orders, in the midst of strange alternatives of thrilling enthusiasm and heart-rending anguish.[43] In 1808, while still a layman, he published, in collaboration with his brother, an anonymous work, *Réflexions sur l'Eglise de France,* a veritable program of almost universal ecclesiastical reform, a work which Fouché, the prefect of police, was eager to suppress. In 1814 appeared a second writing, likewise with his brother's collaboration and also anonymous, the *Tradition de l'Eglise sur l'institution des évêques,* an eloquent defense of "the full and entire authority of the Roman Pontiff" against the pretentions of Gallicanism.

---

[41] The third volume appeared in 1823.

[42] On La Mennais' excessive impressionability and his sickly state, see Boutard, *La Mennais,* I, 6, 37; Spuller, *La Mennais,* p. 41.

[43] Three months after his ordination to the priesthood (June 25, 1816), he wrote: "All that remains for me to do is to arrange myself as well as I can and, if possible, go to sleep at the foot of the stake to which I have been chained."

In these two works, as in various articles that La Mennais contributed to the royalist papers, the *Defenseur,* the *Conservateur,* and the *Drapeau blanc,* readers admired the splendid figures, a rigorous dialectic, and an impetuous style that recalled the manner of Jean Jacques Rousseau. The author of *Emile* seemed to have communicated his emotional power to his former disciple, now his terrible adversary. But La Mennais, undoubtedly unconscious of the fact, took from Rousseau more than his fiery eloquence; and the second volume of the *Essai sur l'indifférence* would reveal the apologist's fundamental mistake, which was the source of all the errors into which he afterwards fell.

We know that the author of the *Social Contract* regarded the will of the people as the origin or at least the manifestation of all right. The author of the *Essai* was far from accepting such a doctrine; it is likewise true that the theory on which he based all certitude closely resembled that of Rousseau. For him the foundation of all truth cannot be the individual reason, but only the universal judgment of mankind. Though he did not say, as he later on said, that the peoples' consent produces all justice, he taught that this consent promulgates all truth. This theory would soon be condemned by Pope Gregory XVI as a "fallacious doctrine," and some of La Mennais' disciples were alarmed at seeing him maintain, "under the vague term of human race a primitive Church, prior and superior to the Jewish Church and the Christian Church." [44] Yet the error did not appear final. For, on the other hand, the author of the *Tradition de l'Eglise* had affirmed his belief "in a full and entire authority of the Roman Pontiff, without any limits but those it imposed on itself." [45] In case of conflict between these two rules of certitude enunciated by the new apologist (the consent of the people and the decision of the supreme head of the Church), on which side would he take his stand? The Church of France had just placed its confidence in this priest. Would he follow the path of obedience, where his Catholic and Roman faith was leading him, or would he follow the way of revolutionary spirit, a way toward which he seemed to be inclined by his restless temperament and certain hidden influences?

---

[44] Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* I, xlv.

The problem was complicated by another one, of a more general sort. Lamartine and Vigny had published their first works. The new literary school, regarding Chateaubriand as its father, had taken the name of romantic school; and its young leader would define romanticism as "liberalism in literature." Romanticism set out to shake off the yoke of pagan mythology and to demolish the artificial rules of the past century. But even that concealed a sharp dualism. Would the new literary school, with a more sincere, living, and Christian accent, revive the faith in souls, or, by a predominance of sentiment over reason, of fancy over order, reform and corrupt the old beliefs from which it purposed drawing its inspirations?

Germany

The same question, on a slightly different ground, arose in Germany. We should recognize that romanticism, so far as it was a revival of the medieval artistic forms and spirit, was born beyond the Rhine.[46] There it was first manifested in the fine arts. A distinguished critic relates its birth thus:

> German classicism had become fixed more and more in a mechanical art. . . . At Eastertime, 1793, Vackenroder and Tieck undertook a

---

[45] *Tradition de l'Eglise,* p. xxv.

[46] It entered France by the channed of the *émigrés,* and especially by the pen of Madame de Staël.

journey of discovery across Germany. They strayed into the churches and cemeteries, meditated near the tombs of Albert Dürer and Peter Fischer. . . . *The Epanchements de cœur d'un moine ami des arts,* which Vackenroder published in 1797, soon became the breviary of many young artists. Yet the best artists of Germany did not draw their inspiration from the national source; the new pilgrims set out for Rome, *Nach Rom;* in Christian Rome, the Rome of the catacombs and the cloisters, was the place where they sought inner counsel and pious inspirations. In 1810, in the abandoned halls of the monastery of San Isidoro on Mount Pincio four young men, excluded from the Vienna Academy for the crime of heresy, founded an association. These were Frederick Overbeck, Franz Pforr, Louis Vogel, and Hettinger. About their meetings for conversation and work others soon gathered, the greatest being Peter Cornelius. The life of these young men, marked by monastic seriousness and regularity, was divided between visits to the basilicas and other churches and personal studies. But their hearts were especially penetrated with emotion when, in the course of a journey through Tuscany, they learned to know Duccio of Siena, Fra Angelico of Fiesole, and Benozzo Gozzoli. In the frankness of their enthusiasm they thought that they had found their true teachers, though scarcely yet able to understand the lessons. By way of derision, their comrades called them "Nazarenes." [47]

The surge of patriotism which took place in Germany during the first years of the last century, on the occasion of the French victories, accentuated the movement of men's minds toward the Middle Ages, where the German fatherland found its origins. Goerres in 1810 wrote: "The German people has succumbed because it has forgotten its character, its purpose, its history, because it has forgotten itself." [48] These lines were a sort of program which Goerres and his friends brought to reality. The year of Austerlitz was the time when Germany, with Arnim and Brentano for teachers, again learned to sing as it had done in the Middle Ages. The year of Jena, at the very time that saw the closing of the tomb of the Holy Empire, was the year when historic and literary romanticism, in refuge at Heidelberg, attempted to reopen the tomb of the old German people." [49]

---

[47] André Michel, in the *Histoire générale,* IX, 349. On the fraternity founded by Overbeck, cf. G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* I, 228–30. With the exception of Cornelius, the members of the group belonged by birth to the Protestant religion.

[48] Goerres, *Politische Schriften,* I, 117–32.

This complexity of the origins of German romanticism was reflected in its character. In the presence of the rich and pure emotions offered by the religion of the Middle Ages, these artists and poets, who at first had been moved by a simply archaeological and aesthetic curiosity, felt themselves brought to disdain the cold religion of Luther and to love that of Rome. Tieck, in *Franz Sternbold,* reproached Protestantism with having produced an empty intellectualism; Novalis proclaimed the praise of Christianity, published the *Hymns to the Virgin,* and lauded the Jesuits.[50] On the other hand, German patriotism, by exalting itself, again found its old bitterness against the Latin genius. The intense aesthetic life of the young German romanticists, not yet free enough from the influence of Goethe and his "cult of self," often developed into a strange individualism. In Tieck's *Sternbold* and in Novalis' *Henri d'Ofterdingen* fancy overflowed into an anarchy that seemed to be the contrary of Catholicism. In a word, in the romantic singing of Germany the *Los von Rom* [51] resounded at the same time as the *Nach Rom.*[52]

In short, the movement toward Rome carried the day. In 1813 Overbeck was converted to the Catholic religion in the hands of the future Cardinal Ostini.

He still had fifty-three years to live. Except for two short spells in Germany, he passed those years in Rome. This humble and modest man, who reminded his visitors of the most emaciated figures of the Siena artists, and who seemed to step down out of an old picture of

[49] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 249.

[50] *Ibid.,* pp. 207, 208, 211.

[51] "Let us withdraw from Rome."

[52] "Let us go to Rome."

holiness, opened a baptistery at Rome, while he was also the head of a school. . . . The painters and sculptors that came down from Germany to the Eternal City felt their eyes open. Rome revealed to them, as Chateaubriand had revealed it to the French, that in Catholicism lay hidden, for the creation of art, a "genius." For nearly thirty years in the German colony at Rome, conversion to Catholicism was a sort of contagious phenomenon. The list of these neophytes would be endless. Before Overbeck, in 1807 we have the Riepenhausen brothers, talented engravers; in 1811 the painter Frederick Cramer. In 1813, at the same time as Overbeck, we have Vogel, director of the Dresden Academy, the painter Louis Schnorr of Carolsfeld, and the archaeologist Platner. After Overbeck, in 1814, came the two Schadows (William, painter and future director of the Dusseldorf Academy, and Rodolph the sculptor) ; they bade farewell to Luther at the very hour when their father Gottfried, also a sculptor, was finishing in Germany a monument of the reformer. Still in 1814 we have the painter Klinkowstrom, who returned from Rome to Vienna and there joined the Catholic Church at the feet of Father Hofbauer, with Frederick Schlegel as his godfather.[53]

Frederick von Schlegel, in the world of historians and philosophers, had already exercised an influence similar to that of Overbeck in the world of artists. Born in 1772 in the city of Hanover, he showed at an early age such an enthusiasm for Hellenism that Schiller bantered him on it. The Greek city, the Greek drama, the Greek temple, had at first been his absolute deal of the beautiful. In 1800, as professor at the Jena University, he delivered lectures on the religion of art before a brilliant audience. Schelling and Hegel, who were among his hearers, reported them to the learned world. Like so many others he was attracted by the romantic movement and eagerly studied the history and literature of the Middle Ages. A purer ideal of beauty, morality, and holiness was revealed to that ardent soul, no less earnest for moral purification than for aesthetic contemplation. In 1805 he abjured Protestantism at

[53] Goyau, *op. cit.*, pp. 229–33.

Cologne and thereafter, in the intellectual circles, became a most zealous apostle of the Catholic religion. His *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur,* his *Ideas on Christian Art,* and especially his *Philosophy of History* are the monuments of his learning and of his pure Catholicism.

At the side of Schlegel we see Count Frederick Leopold von Stolberg, remarkably well prepared for a work of apologetics. By his knowledge of antiquity which Schiller and Goethe might envy, he placed the ancient world at the foot of the cross by the publication of the first fifteen volumes of his *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi,* which appeared from 1807 to 1819. Says Kraus: "This book opens a new era; from this cradle German theology took to its wings." [54] At the same time the tender piety of this noble Christian appeared in his *Büchlein von der Liebe,* a work of his last days.

Other apologists deserve mention along with these two outstanding men: the priest Sailer, whose many works of Christian instruction and piety rendered in Germany the same service as the writings of St. Francis de Sales did in France; Zacharias Werner, that ardent preacher, that combination of Augustine and Savonarola, who in 1815, while preaching at Vienna before the representatives of European diplomacy, recalled, as he struck his breast, the time when, still an unbeliever, he rendered homage to Rousseau; Adam Müller and Charles von Haller, both of them students of government and sociologists after the manner of Bonald and Joseph de Maistre, but more careful to defend the rights of individuals against absolutism; lastly, that humble teacher of youth, Bernard Overberg, son of a simple peddler, who "for half a century would plant the seeds of Christianity in all the fields of Westphalia and there bring them to fruition." [55]

But the man whose activity and renown dominated the whole history of Catholic Germany during this period was Joseph Goerres. Coming from pure Jacobinism to pure Catholicism, taking part in all the political and social events of his time, Joseph Goerres, a universal genius like Leibnitz, pursued his investigations into all the branches of human knowledge and everywhere shed such brilliant light that Catholic German scholarship still regards him as its initiator and guide. Goerres' writings form, as it were, the philosophy of all the social and literary events that unfolded under the Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration.

---

[54] Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise* (French trans.), III, 414.

[55] *Ibid.,* p. 260.

In 1799 his enthusiasm for the Revolution fell suddenly. He went to ask the first consul, Bonaparte, to regulate the liberty of Germany; he failed. So, he said to himself, the French Revolution has not conquered the peoples in order to liberate them. And he exclaimed: "Study Suetonius, for the new Augustus has appeared." Goerres thereupon renounced all political action. Passionately he studied letters and sciences. Henceforth from intellectual culture he sought Germany's regeneration, which the French Revolution was unable to give it. His *Teutschen Volksbücher,* published in 1806, put the people in contact with the ancient national literature of Germany; his *Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt* (1810) won him a place of considerable authority among scholars; the *Rheinische Merkur,* which he founded in 1814, spread his ideas of intellectual renovation everywhere. His Coblenz house became, as it were, a place of pilgrimage where thousands of patriots came to see and consult the great agitator. Napoleon called him "the fifth of the powers confederated against me."

After the fall of the Emperor, Goerres momentarily hoped to see triumph a policy animated by a feeling of respect of peoples and kings. Before long he had the sadness of noting that the decisions of the Congress of Vienna were dictated only by combinations of greed. He protested with his powerful voice. In his book, *Teutschland und die Revolution,* given to the public in 1819, he showed to the princes, with history in hand, that a restoration without God and without the Church would bring them to fresh revolutions. The hatreds that he stirred up obliged him to leave his country. In refuge at Strasbourg, he engaged more and more in religious studies. By his review, *Der Katholik,* and by his book on St. Francis, he prefaced the deep study that he would devote to Henry Suso, and to his great work, *Die Christliche Mystik.* Before his death in 1847, he said: "The revolution cannot long delay. . . . We are now at the end. . . . Pray for the peoples, who no longer count for anything."

With Goerres the romantic movement of Germany entered a new phase. More than Schlegel, Müller, and Haller, this great man sought in the Middle Ages for something besides aesthetic themes. As remarked by the historian of Catholic Germany of the nineteenth century, he had asked of the Middle Ages "lessons in political architecture, maxims of Christian social life, norms for a Christian economic order. . . . For these reasons, when later a popular opinion would have the right to exist, it will not condemn Schlegel, Müller, and Haller as accomplices of the vanquished bureaucracies; as for Goerres, it will honor him as a precursor of the victory." [56]

Unhappily this Catholic current was not the only one that took place. From the study of the Middle Ages, interpreted in the pretended light of a false mysticism and an erroneous philosophy, another current of studies arose, which resulted in ruining the faith in many souls.

Along with Novalis singing *lieder* in honor of the Virgin Mary and with Tieck depicting in *Genovefa* the ardent faith of chivalry, Amadeus Hoffman made alive again in *Bruder Medardus* the terrors which the devil inspired in the Germans of a former age; others devoted themselves to the study of sorcery; in such a coterie of students, they now talked of nothing but somnambulists, clairvoyants, dreams, and presentiments. Those days were the time when Schelling's philosophy, teaching that the dividing line between the conscious and the unconscious cannot be determined, spread in the university circles. The young archaeologists hurled themselves eagerly on this philosophy to find there the synthesis of their historical observations. Said one of them:

---

[56] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 391.

> We read Schelling, who has a talent to influence young minds and easily becomes their tutor. He became our hero. . . . Later the mystical fog of that philosophy disappeared under the rays of the rising sun of Schleiermacher. . . . With Schleiermacher, God was restored, but only by losing His personality; quite the same as Christ, to be placed on His throne again, had to renounce any kind of supernatural prerogative.[57]

The writer of these lines was David Frederick Strauss. At that time he was engaged in the study of the famous *Commentar über das N. T.*[58] by Henry Paulus. Paulus, a disciple of Spinoza and Kant, with a view of ridding the figure and work of Christ from everything supernatural, had tried to provide a natural explanation of each miracle. "But," wrote Strauss, "the reasonings of Paulus appear to me inadmissible. I cannot grant him the right to remove their miraculous character from events while preserving their historical character. A miracle is not a superficial envelope that we can remove superficially. It can be removed only by taking away with it a bit of history." [59] But "thus to take away the whole history" of Christ is to destroy all religion. A deep study of Hegel extricated the exegete from his embarrassment. There he learned that "the Christian religion and philosophy have the same content: the former under the form of the image, the latter under the form of the idea." [60] The principle of the solution had been

[57] Strauss, *Essai d'histoire religieuse* (French trans.), pp. 225, 248.

[58] This work came out between 1800 and 1804.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[60] *Commentar über das N. T.*

found. To safeguard Christianity, he would simply have to admit that the accounts of miraculous happenings are figures symbolizing the faith. In 1803 the learned Christian philologist Heyne had enunciated the following principle: "From myth all history and all the philosophy of the ancients derive their source." Creuzer interpreted paganism as a religious symbolism, under which was hidden an older and purer faith. Wolf, enlarging the theory, applied it to the poems of Homer. Strauss set to work and wrote the book which, published in 1836, made his name famous: *Leben Jesus.* It was not destined to be a durable work; but, though not yet ruined by criticism, it did accomplish in many minds the work of destruction begun by Paulus, who had denied the supernatural in the Gospel narrative. Strauss denied even its authenticity;[61] and the religion that it pretended to erect on these ruins was but a vague Christianity, without rational consistency and without historic support.

England

The study of the Middle Ages had in like manner in England been the starting point of a religious movement. The historian of *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre* credits the novels of Walter Scott with an influence comparable to that of the writings of Chateaubriand in France and of Goerres in Germany.[62] The fine example given by the French *émigré* priests prepared England to relish the history of the Catholic heroes. From 1814 to 1824, a period when the masterpieces of the great novelist appeared, the English became exceedingly fond of those gallant knights and crusaders who prayed to the Virgin Mary, marched behind the banners of their patron saints, confessed their sins to a priest, and obeyed the pope. The Catholics described by Newman at the beginning of the century, "found in corners and alleys and cellars," trembling like a timid flock overawed "by the high Protestants, the lords of the earth,"[63] now felt less weighed down by the atmosphere of contempt which formerly surrounded them. They raised their heads. Even the Anglican Church was penetrated by a gentler and more flexible spirit. The same Newman relates the deep impression made on him, in the fall of 1816, by the reading of a *Church History* by Joseph Bilners, an Anglican theologian of the evangelical school, in which were to be found long passages from the Fathers, and some time later, by a sermon of Doctor Hawkins, renowned Oxford preacher, on the doctrine of tradition. The preacher declared that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine and that, if we wish to learn the doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularities of the Church, such as the catechism and the creeds.[64]

---

[61] On the history of the rationalist exegesis in Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century, see Vigouroux, *Les Livres Saints et la critique rationaliste,* II, 436–50.

[62] Paul Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre,* 1899, Vol. I, chap. 2. Newman and Pusey speak of the influence of Walter Scott. Cf. *Life of Pusey,* I, 254.

We must not suppose, however, that this tendency led solely to Catholicism. The writers who, after Walter Scott, enjoyed public favor (Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey), those poets of quiet solitudes and peaceful woods, those Lake poets, as they were called, often turned the religious sentiment in the direction of unsubstantial dreaminess or depressing melancholy. Newman remarks that ridicule and contempt were still systematically directed against the Catholics;[65] even those who were introducing Catholic ceremonial into Anglican worship kept their prejudices against the Roman Church. You might say that in certain minds the evolution which was leading them toward Catholicism by giving them a closer view of it, by that same fact re-awakened the old antipathies and that the more conversion became logically necessary, the more they stiffened themselves against it.[66]

---

[63] *The Second Spring,* § 12; preached at Oscott, July 13, 1852.

[64] Newman, *History of My Religious Opinions.*

[65] Newman, *op. cit.*

---

[66] See Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*

CHAPTER XII

The Foreign Missions

As we have seen, Europe was not the only part of the world to suffer from the revolutionary distress. From one point of view the disaster that nearly everywhere afflicted the foreign missions seemed deeper and harder to repair. Already under the old regime the regrettable disputes that arose between certain religious orders had considerably disturbed their apostolic works. In 1772 the suppression of the Society of Jesus, which furnished the entire mission field 16,000 subjects, was a most baleful blow to them. The infiltration of rationalist philosophy had spread in Europe, even in Christian circles, a practical indifference that amounted to a diminution of zeal and had dried up the source of apostolic vocations.[1] Lastly, the spoliation of the clergy's possessions by the Revolution considerably lessened the resources of the missions; and, if we except the United States and Canada, where particular circumstances favored the activity of the *émigré* priests, everywhere else their poverty and isolation and the lack of organization and resources paralyzed their good will. In one place Christian centers succumbed under the blow of violent persecutions; in another place, deprived of priests and public worship, they slowly dissolved.

But in the first years of the Restoration three chief facts reanimated the work that seemed to be dying and to give it a new impulse. These three were: in 1814 the restoration of the Society of Jesus; in 1815 the reconstitution of the Society of the Foreign Missions; from 1815 to 1822 the founding and organization of the work of the Propagation of the Faith. Thanks to these three events, the undertaking of the missions again found workers and resources. The Church, without ceasing its strife against the disciples of Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, and Hegel, again came into contact with the naturalist cults of China, India, and the savage tribes of America, with the metaphysical cults of the Brahman philosophers and educated Buddhists, and with the moral and social culture of Islam;[2] in civilized lands it combatted all the forms of learned unbelief, and in uncivilized countries all degrees of spontaneous superstition.

---

[1] Father Bucker, in *Etudes* of February 20, 1899, p. 551, notes that the number of missioners in 1789 probably did not exceed 300.

Interest in the Foreign Missions

Although the notable mission movement was not resumed until after the fall of the Empire, anyone would be mistaken if he were to attribute to the Emperor a systematic hostility to these religious undertakings.[3] Napoleon at an early hour understood that colonial expansion would be the principal aim of the governments in the nineteenth century, and he perfectly discerned the help which the Catholic missions would be able to supply to the development of the French colonial empire and to the revival of French prestige abroad. Thus at the peace of Amiens (1802) we see him imperiously demanding the restitution of all the colonial conquests of the French Revolution and, as soon as the peace was signed, work with feverish eagerness at reconstituting the French colonial hegemony.[4] At the same time he asked Portalis for a report on the Catholic missions.

---

[2] We know that the historians make a distinction between: 1. the naturalist religions; 2. the metaphysical religions; 3. the religions more specially moral and social. Cf. Carra de Vaux, "Les religions non chretiennes," in *Un siècle* (1900), pp. 694–729.

[3] See Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France*, p. 424.

[4] Alfred Rambaud, *La France coloniale* (1895), p. 33.

This report, dated November 7, 1802, proposes to the first consul that he sustain and encourage the French missioners, chiefly the Vincentians and the priests of the Foreign Missions. The following reasons are adduced: 1. the Catholic missions promote the welfare of humanity, and France will be honored by contributing "to the common interest of all nations and all mankind"; 2. the Catholic missions are one of the most effective means of serving the interests and glory of the French nation; 3. France should not let herself be outstripped by England, which has grasped the usefulness of the missions in conquered countries and favors them with all her might.[5]

Public opinion showed itself favorable to the missioners. The eloquent pages that Chateaubriand devoted to them in the *Génie du christianisme* had produced a deep impression everywhere. Pius VII was disposed to encourage the work wholeheartedly. One of his conspicuous concerns had been the reconstitution of the College of Propaganda, founded in 1622 by Gregory XV. The establishment had been sacked in 1798, but a senate decree (April 2, 1808), which united the States of the Church to the French Empire, declared that the debts of Propaganda would become debts of the Empire and that the property and income of the establishment would be administered by a commission, in which the Marquis de Fortia was a member. This marquis, by his prudence and zeal, seconded Pius VII in his views for the re-establishment of the college. Gradually new students were able to be received there; the chapel, which had become a storehouse, was restored to the use of worship, and the institution of the Propaganda soon was in a position to continue the mission assigned to it by Gregory XV: this mission was to give to the apostolate of distant nations both resources and subjects.

Unfortunately the great wars of the Empire hindered the projects as they did so many others. This fact was the more regrettable since the Protestant nations, Holland and especially England, continued to favor their missioners. The Bible Society, founded in London in 1780, with its revenue increased in fifty years from 5,000 pounds to 200,000, was a mighty auxiliary of the Protestant missioners. According to official statistics, in one year the Bible Society, sixty years after its foundation, distributed nearly 1,700,000 Bibles besides religious tracts and in every way sustained the preachers of the Reformation.[6]

---

[5] Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères,* II, 356–59.

Thus we are not surprised that, with peace restored to Europe, the missions aroused considerable enthusiasm.

New Apostolic Workers

In the bull *Sollicitudo* (August 7, 1814), which re-established the Society of Jesus, Pius VII exhorted "all the superiors, all the provincials, all the rectors, and all the members of the re-established Society to show themselves faithful imitators of their father." In this connection a historian of the Jesuits writes: "The Society of Jesus did not abdicate its genius of evangelical conquests; it did not give up its inheritance of martyrdom and of the promotion of civilization which its predecessors bequeathed to it. Its memories of past times, the wishes of the peoples, and the needs of religion became a law for the new Jesuits to enter again the career of the missions." [7] This enthusiasm did not weaken, since, almost a century later, the Company of Jesus would by itself, furnish the various foreign missions almost 4,000 missioners.[8]

On March 2, 1815, an ordinance of King Louis XVIII re-established the Society of Foreign Missions, which had been dissolved by a decree of Napoleon (September 26, 1809).[9] The glorious future of this Society could be foreseen when, in 1815, it again took the road of the Indies and of martyrdom.

---

[6] William Marshall, *Christian Missions,* I, 12.

[7] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus,* VI, 351.

[8] Brucker, *Etudes* of February 20, 1899, p. 552.

[9] A. Launay, *Histoire générale de la Société des Missions étrangères,* II, 433.

> Inaugurated in 1658 by the first vicars apostolic and finally founded in 1663, the Society of Foreign Missions had already existed for 157 years. Its birth had been painful; its growth, slow. At no period had the number of its priests reached sixty in number. The fact is not without some surprise; but admiration mingles with the astonishment when we consider its vast field of battle, the numerous events in which it was involved, and the success it obtained. . . . It had been obliged to strive against Portugal, which looked upon it as a foe of the spiritual power of its bishops; against the pagan governments of Siam, Cochin China, Tonkin, and China; against the Mohamedans of Sumatra; against the English Protestants of Canada and the Indies. . . . Some of its missions had given excellent results. Yunnan, Kongchow, Cambodia, and Siam were in a very sad situation; but Cochin China, Tonkin, and Su-tchuen were prosperous and solid. The native clergy, trained by the Society and always exclusively secular, were pious, able, and devoted; these had again and again saved the Churches. . . . In France the Society endured the Revolution, refusing apostasy, living in exile, buying back its seminary. Such was its past.[10]

Shortly afterwards, Bishop de Mazenod founded at Aix the congregation of Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and at Lyons Father Colin created that of the Marist Fathers. Both these societies would go at the side of the old revived congregations of Dominicans, Redemptorists, and Vincentians, to beg the honor of engaging in the most remote and most dangerous missions.[11]

The initiative of some humble women of France soon furnished to these valiant forces the resources which they needed for their apostolate.

---

[10] Launay, *op. cit.*, p. 488.

[11] The institute of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, founded in 1807 by Madame Javouhey, would be of great help for the missioners.

In 1815 Bishop Dubourg of New Orleans, on his way back from Rome, communicated to a devout widow of Lyons, Madame Petit, the idea of founding an association of popular alms, by way of one franc a year, to back up the spiritual needs of Louisiana. The few and small offerings collected by her did not form a large treasury; but it was the widow's mite. . . . In 1819 Miss Pauline Jaricot, a young woman of Lyons, received from her brother, a seminarian at St. Sulpice, a letter expressing his grief over the destitution of the foreign missions. This pious woman organized among the working people of Lyons a collection in the amount of one sou a week for the Foreign Mission Seminary. In this way 2,000 francs were collected and sent to that seminary, to be forwarded by it to that old Asia from which Lyons had received the blessing of the faith.

The two sources were merged some years later on the occasion of the visit of Bishop Dubourg's vicar general. A meeting of twelve persons of Lyons decided that the Association should be extended to all the missions of the globe and that the membership should be solicited and received without geographical limitation. The date was May 3, 1822, the feast of the Finding of the True Cross. On that day the Propagation of the Faith Society was founded.

The receipts of the first month had been 520 francs from the diocese of Lyons, those of the first year rose to 15,272 francs. In 1838 the work took in 1,343,000 francs. Two years later it gathered in more than 2,000,000, and thereafter the receipts continued to increase.[12]

Meanwhile the work had been organized. The members were asked to supply priests as well as alms. Later on, two other similar works, that of the Holy Infancy and that of the schools of the Orient, would further augment the budget of the missions and would permit every Christian, even children, to contribute, by their prayers and their sacrifices, to the glorious work of the apostolate, which has always been a marked characteristic of the true Church and a most striking sign of its vitality.

---

[12] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* pp. 426–28.

Korea

Pope Pius VII was unable to witness in this world the fruit of all this devotedness. But before he rendered his soul to God (August, 1823), if his gaze turned toward the infidel nations where the missioners would direct their steps, his heart would have been filled with most legitimate hopes. You might have said that when Providence was arousing a new zeal in the Catholic peoples, it was preparing the souls of far-off peoples to receive the blessings of that zeal.

One of the first regions to which the thought of Pius VII turned, when the events of 1815 restored peace to the world, was Korea. He recalled that in 1792, amid the distress, he received the homage of a Church founded in that country, a Church that, while he was a prisoner at Fontainebleau, had sent him a moving appeal of the Korean faithful asking for priests.

The way this Korean Church had been formed seemed to be one of the most touching miracles of the divine goodness. This instance is the only example of a country converted apart from any apostolate from the outside.

Korea, an extensive mountainous peninsula of northeast Asia, situated between the Japan Sea and the Yellow Sea, had, like China, whose vassal it was, its security in absolute isolation. At the close of the eighteenth century this closed country had never seen a priest. At that time a few wise men of the country happened upon some books of Catholic devotion, written in Chinese characters and accidentally imported along with certain scientific works. These Catholic books impressed them. One of them, Seng-Houn-i, made contact with the bishop of Peking, the illustrious Alexander de Gouvea, a Portuguese

Franciscan, who instructed and baptized him. Thereafter the neophyte had but one desire: since China and Europe would not send catechists to his country, he himself became a catechist. Aided by one of his friends, the virtuous Piki, he instructed many fellow countrymen and baptized them. These in turn became apostles. Books of instruction composed by the missioners of China were translated into Korean and were circulated in the world of the educated, then in the middle class and among the common people.

The faith of these new Christians was so sturdy that when, in 1791, orders from Peking commanded them to renounce their new religion, a considerable number of them courageously underwent the tortures of the bastinado, the disjointing of the bones, and other forms of suffering. A Chinese priest, James Tsiou, was finally sent to them in 1794. The loftiest virtues, virginity, humility, charity, flourished in the young Church. Two new persecutions (1799 and 1801) were met with the same courage. Father Tsiou, after being subjected to the ordinary sufferings, was beheaded on May 31, 1801. Pius VII could do nothing for these admirable Christians of Korea except to sustain them by his paternal encouragement and to place them under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Peking. His successor, Leo XII, would organize the mission, confiding it to the Society of Foreign Missions and placing at its head as vicar apostolic Bishop Bruguière.[13]

Not far from there, another prodigy of grace, which Europe was to learn of only later on, occurred in Japan under no less wonderful circumstances. Twenty-five Christian centers, going back to St. Francis Xavier himself, thanks to the transmission of their traditions, without any sacraments but baptism, preserved the sacred fire of the true faith. They were confidently awaiting a priest to whom they would entrust themselves. This priest they would recognize by three signs: his devotion to the Blessed Virgin, his obedience to the pope, and his vow of virginity.[14]

---

[13] See De Gouvea, *Relation de l'établissement du christianisme dans le royaume de Corée,* 1800; Dallet, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Corée;* A. Launay, *Les missionaires français en Corée,* 1895.

India

We have already noted that the French Revolution had sad consequences for the Church of the Indies. In the colonies which the treaty of Versailles in 1783 restored to France,[15] two former Jesuits, a few Capuchins, and some priests of the Foreign Missions were laboring under the orders of Bishop Champenois. The combined persecutions of the Moslem sultan Tippo-Saibet and the revolutionary agents coming from France scattered priests and faithful. One of the missioners, Father Dubois of the Society of the Foreign Missions, wrote (September 15, 1798): "What will become of us? Persecuted and proscribed by the French, suspected by the English, abandoned by the Portuguese clergy, God alone will be our help." [16] In 1805 Bishop Champenois, exhausted by sickness and fatigue, in vain asked for an auxiliary. In 1813 the seminary founded at Pondichery was at the end of its resources. Three years later Father Dubois wrote: "All, as many of us as are here, are overwhelmed, some by age, the others by infirmities. Can you not send us one or two subjects to bury us?" [17]

Almost discouraged, its apparent influence over a population which the revolutionary spirit endeavored to mislead, at the same time as the Moslem fanaticism terrorized it, Father

---

[14] Marnas, *La religion de Jésus au Japon,* I, 488; A. Launay, "Le Japon," in the *Missions catholiques françaises au XIXe siècle,* III, 417.

[15] Pondichery, Karikal, Mahe, and Chandernagor.

[16] See the interesting pamphlet by Mazon, *Un missionaire vivarois aux Indes, l'abbé Dubois* (1899), p. 14.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 16.

Dubois devoted himself especially to works of corporal charity and to the composition of a great work on the customs of the country that he was evangelizing. But his work was not as fruitless for the apostolate as he thought. The benefactor of the poor and the scholar prepared the way for the catechist. By his charity as also by his learning he won the good will of the great and of the common people. The English governor of Madras wrote: "When Father Dubois in his journeys was on his way to a village, the Brahmans, by a spontaneous feeling of deference, made everything spic and span, and prepared everything to receive him." [18] The high council of the Company of India, at a price of 20,000 francs, bought from him his great work, *Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde,* and had it printed in English at London in 1817. The learned Max Muller, in his preface to a later edition of this work, in 1897, says that the work is that of an eyewitness and still retains all its value.[19] The 20,000 francs was used by Dubois for the reorganization of the Pondichery seminary; but especially the high regard which the zealous missioner had acquired and which later benefited his fellow workers wonderfully prepared men's minds for the great mission movement that would take place fifteen years later in the region of the French Indies.

---

[18] Mazon, *op. cit.,* p. 20.

[19] For Muller's preface, see Mazon, *op. cit.,* pp. 61–63. In 1825 Father Dubois published in French a carefully revised edition: *Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde.* This edition is now rare and can be found in the *Bibliothèque nationale* under the classification OK 2.149. Father Dubois was born at Saint-Remèze in the Vivarais (January 10, 1766) and died at the Foreign Mission Seminary on February 17, 1848. He published also, in English, *Letters on the State of Christianity in India,* 1823; and in French, *Exposé de quelques-uns des principaux articles de la theologie de Brahma,* 1825; *Le Pancha-Tautra, fables de brahme Vichnou,* 1826, re-edited in 1872, with thirteen engravings by Leonce Petit. The *Tablet* (May 7, 1898) commented that the celebrated book of Dubois is an encyclopedia of all that concerns Indian life; the author's political finesse and the clearness of his mind would do honor to a statesman.

China

This method of penetration by the prestige of learning was one which experience had shown as the most effective in the atmosphere of the Chinese population. It was the method employed in China, following the Jesuits, by the Vincentians and priests of the Foreign Missions, who replaced them after their dispersion.[20] From 1775 to 1823 their work of evangelization was hindered by violent persecutions; but the courage of the Christians, the martyrdom of Blessed Dufresse in 1815 and that of Blessed Clet in 1820 recalled the most heroic times of the history of the Church.

The first three Vincentians reached Peking on April 29, 1785. They were Father Raux, a distinguished astronomer and pupil of Lalande, Father Ghislain, a man of cultivated mind and one well versed in science, and Brother Paris, a clock maker whose mechanical ability was said to equal that of Vaucanson. A few former Jesuits, who had remained in China, aided them unselfishly. Father Bourgeois, former head of the mission, presented Father Raux to the Emperor; and Father Aymot ceded to the learned Vincentian his functions of imperial interpreter for the Europeans. Sons of St. Ignatius and children of St. Vincent de Paul fraternized with touching intimacy. Father Bourgeois in 1788 wrote to his confrere Father Beauregard, the renowned preacher: "No one can say whether Father Raux is living as a Jesuit, or whether we are living as Vincentians." [21] This evangelical union obtained the happiest results. The missioners succeeded in having admitted into the great library founded at Peking by Emperor Khien-Long several Christian works, among them the *Tien-tchou-che-i* (The True idea of God) by Father Ricci, a masterpiece that certain mandarins read and reread to train themselves in literary style. Under Khien-Long's successor, Kia-Khing, in 1800, while Catholic worship was still persecuted in France, forbidden in England, and disturbed in Italy, a solemn procession, reported in the *Annales,* was able to be held in the streets of Peking, on the feast of Corpus Christi.[22] In 1803 the vicar of Se-tchuen, Bishop Dufresse, of the Foreign Missions, profiting by the peace, held the first Chinese synod.

---

[20] The decree of Propaganda entrusting the missions of China to the Vincentians is dated December 7, 1783.

[21] Huc, *Le christianisme en Chine,* IV, 230.

The statutes coming from this synod are the most important act that has been published, since the *Monita* of 1664, to regulate the conditions of missionary life in China. The statutes are divided into ten chapters. The life of the missioner is regulated as a life of prayer, of retreat, and of interior silence. He is then advised to exercise great prudence in his outward relations, discretion in his alms collecting, in the administration of temporalities, in the imposition of public penances, for which the opportuneness must always be submitted to the judgment of the bishop. Then the statutes speak of apostolic zeal, of attempts to found Christian schools, of measures to be employed to prevent the Catholics from participating in the superstitious customs of the pagans. We quote the following comment by a historian of this mission.

> By a good fortune which is not granted to all, Bishop Dufresse had time to apply the rules he had composed, to supervise their functioning, and to have them penetrate the habits of his fellow workers. No persecution, no political disturbance, was able to prevail against the vigor which the continual observance of the wise regulations gave to the mission of Se-tchuen, which thenceforth remained like those monuments that a tempest assails without being able to shake their solid foundations.
>
> Eleven years passed in this relative tranquillity. But, toward the end of 1814, a pagan made known to the viceroy of Se-tchuen, Chang-Ming, the state of the mission, which he learned while feigning a wish

---

[22] *Annales,* XXI, 7.

to embrace Christianity. He divulged the establishment of the seminary, the number of the students and professors, and denounced by name Bishop Dufresse, who was arrested on May 18, 1815 and led to Tcheu-tou, the capital of the province.

The Bishop remained in prison for four months and underwent several interrogatories. On September 14, the viceroy Chang-Min summoned him before him. The high mandarin had previously made himself acquainted with all the documents of the trial, and resolved to issue a capital sentence against the prelate and to carry it out without referring it to the Emperor.

As soon as Bishop Dufresse appeared, the viceroy at once assembled all his officers and condemned the prisoner to be beheaded. We are told that the saintly old man summoned his judge to God's tribunal and told him that his own death would come soon; this prediction was, in fact, realized.

He was stripped of his shirt, which two soldiers tore up. He was led on foot to an open place at the north gate, situated outside the city and about a mile from the palace. Thirty-three Christians were taken from their prison and were brought to the same place, surrounded by executioners and by all the apparatus of the punishment. On their arrival a mandarin ordered them to renounce Christ. In the presence of the immense crowd gathered about them, the faithful, with a single exception, protested that they were ready to die. Kneeling down, they asked the holy Bishop to absolve them from their faults, to strengthen them, and to console them by granting them his last blessing. The prelate delivered a short exhortation and gave them absolution. Then, without displaying any emotion, he turned to his executioner and bowed his head. The soldier raised and lowered his sword, and the head of the victim rolled on the ground.[23]

The next year, Pius VII in the course of an allocution spoke of this death, saying: "As we read the account, we seemed to be reading again the annals of the primitive Church." Bishop Dufresse was declared Blessed by Leo XIII in 1900.

The persecution, begun in 1815, continued for several years.

---

[23] A. Launay, *Les missions catholiques françaises au XIXe siècle,* III, 254–57; *Histoire des Missions étrangères,* II, 439–47.

The most outstanding event of that period was the martyrdom of Blessed Cletus, a religious of the Congregation of St. Lazare. This seventy-two-year-old priest lived in the mountains of the province of Hong-Kang, harbored by some Christian families. A reward of 1,000 taels (about $1,500) was promised to anyone who would have him arrested. In the course of several months the holy priest evaded all attempts to find him, hiding in caves and often changing his abode. He was seized on June 6, 1819. With no regard for his old age, his executioners treated him shamefully, striking his face with leather thongs, and loading him with heavy chains. He was strangled for the faith on February 18, 1820. As in the case of Bishop Dufresse, the Church has placed him in the number of her Blessed.

Chinese priests, catechists, and simple faithful were also put to death. Others were thrown into prison, sent into exile to the depths of Tartary. Yet the work of evangelization, without gaining ground, was strengthened. The distress in which the Christians found themselves provoked admirable acts of charity. A letter, written by a missioner under date of September 16, 1820, and inserted in the *Annales,* says: "We are always in hiding, often with Christians who are not well off. Almost all of them are poor. Those who would have been able to help us have suffered notable losses during the persecutions." [24] Bishop Fontana, a Portuguese Vincentian, vicar apostolic of Se-tchuen, wore clothes that were in rags. In 1824, Bishop Florens, of the Foreign Mission Society, bishop of Sozopolis, former coadjutor of Bishop Dufresse, sold his spare clothes to buy rice for some Chinese dying of hunger. We see here the duplication of the first Christian communities, having but one heart and soul, giving a hopeful promise, for a time of peace, of a magnificent flowering of Catholic life.

On the other hand, the national feeling of the Chinese grew more bitter. One of the pretexts in the recent persecutions had been the seizure, on the person of a messenger, of letters and topographical data, intended for Europe. In fact, Emperor Napoleon in 1805, impressed by the influence which the prosperity of the Far East missions might exercise in favor of the French policy, had set aside special aid for them and had chosen three learned men to carry out a lay mission in China.[25] The Austrian war, then the war with England, prevented their departure. But King George wrote to the emperor of China, putting him on his guard against the undertakings of the French.[26] As might be foreseen, "Europe, penetrating China by force, would bring there a new element of power, but also, we must say, a danger to the evangelical workers." [27]

---

[24] *Annales,* I, no. 6, p. 26.

In short, the religious situation of the mission countries, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century,[28] was not without an analogy to that of the European countries at the same period. As in France, where the religious aspirations, expressed by Chateaubriand and La Mennais, offered more than one ambiguity; as in Germany, where the romantic current separated in two opposite tendencies; as in England, where the impulse that would lead Newman to Catholicism was counterbalanced by that which fixed Keble and Pusey in ritualism; everywhere mankind appeared to be raised up by a mighty movement of grace toward an era of Catholic renewal, but also to be everywhere imperiled by the spirit of evil; and fidelity to this movement of grace depended on a choice for which man's freedom would have to bear the dread responsibility.

---

[25] Bishop Favier, in the *Missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e^ siècle,* III, 70.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] A. Launay, in the *Missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e^ siècle,* III, 258.

[28] We have merely wished here to cast a rapid glance over the principal Catholic missions having historical significance from 1775 to 1823. For many countries the preaching of the gospel dates from the middle of the nineteenth century. The most complete work on this matter is that of Louvet, *Les missions catholiques au XIX^e^ siècle,* 1898.

CHAPTER XIII

The Eastern Church

THE turmoils that accompanied what we have come to call the Period of the Revolution were not without influence on certain branches of the Eastern Church. This condition is what we are about to review in the following pages.[1]

The Non-Catholic Greek Church of Constantinople

Between 1789 and 1823 the see of Constantinople saw the passing of eleven patriarchates, but only eight patriarchs. The most remarkable was Gregory V, who occupied the see three times (1797–98, 1806–8, 1818–21). He ended the famous controversy of the *colybes,* accomplished numerous reforms, all of which unfortunately did not survive him, and died a martyr for the cause of Hellenic independence.

The *colybes* are wheaten cakes, abundantly sprinkled with sugar and variously decorated, which are blessed in church, according to the Eastern rite, on the occasion of funeral anniversaries or on the feasts of saints. They are a Christian survival of the use of funeral repasts by the ancients. That is all, however, that we can scientifically say about their origin. The *colybes* are used chiefly in the commemorative services taking place on the third and the fortieth day after death.[2]

In the Greek monastic liturgy Saturday is a day particularly consecrated to services of this kind for all the dead, especially for the deceased benefactors of the monastery. Around the year 1754, the construction of a new church for a skyte, or secondary convent, of Mount Athos caused donations to flow in and consequently many requiem services to be celebrated. The monks of Athos, who went to the market of Karyes on Saturday to sell the products of their small industry (ikons, sculptured wood, and so on),[3] got the idea of transposing a good number of the services for the dead to Sunday.

---

[1] This chapter comes from the pen of Father Cyril Karalevsky, a priest of the Greco-Slavic rite.

[2] The reader will note a slight difference from the Western usage of the third, seventh, and thirtieth days.

We can hardly imagine the uproar this innovation excited on the "Holy Mountain" and in the ecclesiastical world, the mass of pamphlets, petitions, and appeals to the Ecumenical Patriarch, besides the forcible expulsions wrought now by one party and presently by the other, or the death of those monks whom their adversaries cast into the sea by way of argument. This fact would be unbelievable if the accounts of the contemporaries did not attest it.[4] We find therein all the names of Greek theology of the time: Athanasius of Paros, Nicodemus the Hagiographer, Agapios Leonardos—all for the conservative position which sought to keep the observances on Saturday. Nevertheless Patriarch Theodosius II left to all the liberty to do as they wished, and prevented the two parties from excommunicating each other and from deviating from the usages of the principal convents. In 1776, Sophron II excommunicated the advocates of Saturday alone and effected the return of peace for a time. In 1800, the monk Theodoret, commissioned to revise the essays of the famous *Pidalion* (of which we shall speak later on), introduced into it a long note which was contrary to the opinions of Agapios and Nicodemus, and Patriarch Neophytus VII had to issue a special encyclical to point out the corrections that must be included in the text. The conflict, which had involved the whole Greek world, became localized on Mount Athos, and, in 1807 and 1819, Gregory V renewed the right for everyone to do as he was accustomed. Today, curiously enough, the commemorative services are almost always on Sunday, and this practice for the same reason had caused the monks of Athos to introduce the innovation: it is the day when everyone is free.

---

[3] Karyes is the village where the quaimaqam, or Turkish subprefect, resides; it is also the place where all visitors are obliged to halt. See the interesting account of the journey of Father Placid de Mester, O.S.B.: *Voyage de deux Bénedictins au monastère du Mont Athos* (1908), pp. 43 ff. This book is a good popularization of what should be known about Athos. I have only one fault to find with it: it gives too roseate a picture of the holy mountain of the Orthodox world and it suppresses too much the deep wretchedness.

[4] See L. Petit, "La grande controverse des colybes," in the *Echos d'Orient,* II (1899), 321–31; the principal documents in Mansi, XXXVIII, 937–40, 945; XL, 39–44, 79–82.

Another equally childish quarrel deserves mention only because it exemplifies the exaggerated attachment that was held for certain customary rituals in the Greco-Slavic countries. It recalls certain aspects of the schism of the Starovier Russians and that of the Utraquists of Bohemia. Patriarch Gregory V had one other merit: his reforming views occasioned his first downfall, after only a year and a half in the patriarchate, at the end of 1798. Re-elected in October, 1806, he at once resumed the same line of conduct: acts regulating the affairs of the bishops absent from the capital, the meetings of the Holy Synod, the regular collection of the taxes, and clerical and monastic discipline, appeared one after another.[5] The following year he made a tour for the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist.[6] Deposed at the end of September, 1808, Gregory remounted the patriarchal throne at the end of 1818, at the time when the Hetaeria, formed in Walachia with a view to rendering liberty to Greece, caused more and more discussion of that subject. He had time to terminate the controversy over the *colybes,* as we have seen, and to proclaim afresh the canonical law which prevented clerics in major orders from contracting second marriages after the death of their first wife.[7]

---

[5] See these documents in Mansi, XL, 3–26.

[6] Mansi, XL, 27–38.

When the Greek revolution burst into the open, the Turks, as might be expected, laid the blame on the higher clergy as a consequence of their civil privileges, which made them the leaders of the nation. Gregory, evidently as a matter of form, had to launch excommunication against the chiefs of the movement.[8] Nevertheless he was seized at the beginning of the Easter ceremonies of April 10–23, 1821, and was strangled, and his corpse was hung at the gate of the patriarchal palace, where it remained exposed for three days before being delivered to the Jews. The members of the Holy Synod were given over to torture. The Greeks considered Gregory a martyr for the national cause rather than for the Orthodox faith, and his benediction cross is preserved at the Phanar as a relic which is shown to the people on tragic occasions.[9]

On the very day which saw the execution of Gregory, the Turks caused Eugenius, the metropolitan of Pisidia, to be elected in his place.[10] This election, however, did not prevent the sack of several churches, and in vain Eugenius renewed the excommunication that had been rigorously pronounced by Gregory, thereby smiting seven bishops of continental Greece.[11] The reaction to this sentence was the proclamation of the Assembly of Epidaurus (1822), which declared Greece independent, religiously as well as politically. This move was the beginning of the effective emancipation of the Church of Greece which we shall see proclaimed again later on and finally recognized by the patriarch of Constantinople, though not until 1850.

---

[7] Mansi, XL, 83–86.

[8] The text in Mansi, XL, 151–55.

[9] For example, at the end of August, 1911, at the time of the manifestations that took place at Constantinople following the assassination, probably perpetrated by emissaries of the "Union and Progress" Committee of Emilien, metropolitan of Grevena.

[10] Mansi, XL, 91.

[11] The text in Mansi, XL, 155–58.

Eugenius II, chosen in the midst of these tragic circumstances, was mercilessly beaten by the Turkish populace and died of exhaustion and sorrow in the following year (1822).

Several other patriarchs followed rapidly in the see of Constantinople, always the butt of the Turks' vexations until the time when the Greek independence was at last recognized by the Porte under pressure of the Powers.

The second patriarchate of Neopytus VII (1789–1801) saw the appearance of a work that has remained famous in the history of the canon law of the Orthodox Church: the *Pidalion* (the helm, or rudder), a large folio of 556 pages, published at Leipzig in 1800. This collection contains the original texts of the monuments of the ancient law of the Greek Church, that is, the so-called canons of the apostles, those of the first seven ecumenical councils, those of the particular councils received within the body of the Byzantine law, the decisions of certain Fathers arranged under the same title, a treatise on the degrees of kindred, some formulas for official acts, and the plan of a church constructed according to canonical regulations.

The texts are accompanied with an explanation gathered by the authorized commentators of the Greek ecclesiastical law: Balsamon (patriarch of Antioch), Zonaras, Alexis Aristenus, and others. This explanation is translated into vulgar Greek. At the bottom of the pages are long notes, likewise in vulgar Greek, which form a second commentary. They are the work of two monks of Athos, Agapios Leonardos (1741–1815) and Nicodemus the Hagiographer (1749–1809).[12] These notes are most curious. They are not remarkable for great canonical erudition, but by way of compensation they contain many childish trifles, traditions of uncertain value, and especially an arsenal of prejudices against the Catholic Church. The first edition has a particular value because it lacks the corrections introduced in the later reprinting. The *Pidalion,* completed by the synodal decisions of the patirarch of Constantinople and in the Kingdom of Greece by the Holy Synod, and by the civil laws on religious matters, forms even today the great source of modern Greek canon law. We need scarcely say that, produced by the Orthodox, this collection has next to no authority for Catholics outside of the personal skill of Agapios and Nicodemus, which was just as meager.

---

[12] On Agapios Leonardos, see the article of Petit in the *Echos d'Orient*, II (1899), 204–6.

From the theological point of view, the Greek Church, properly speaking, did not produce a single name during the period which we are now studying, with the exception of Eugenius Bulgaris, to be compared with those of the preceding age. Its minds were unfortunately too much occupied by the question of the *colybes.* We must mention, however, that Christodulus of Acarnania, after traveling extensively in Europe and visiting some philosophers of every opinion, embraced the doctrines of Spinoza. He was accordingly condemned some months after his death by the patriarch Neophytus VII during his first patriarchate.[13]

However, general instruction did not develop among the Greeks of that time. In 1765, in the Peloponnesus, Agapios Leonardos and his confrere Gerasimus founded the school of Dimitsana, which has become lastingly famous. That of the Convent of St. John the Evangelist at Patmos continued to prosper until the death of Daniel Kerameus (1801) and the Greek insurrection. The theological school of Athos, opened in 1758 at the monastery of Vatopedi by Eugenius Bulgaris, maintained itself intact until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The spread of education prepared the affranchisement of Greece.

Nicodemus the Hagiographer, whose name we have seen in connection with the *Pidalion,* was also a prolific writer. He translated into the vulgar tongue the liturgical works of Simeon of Thessalonica and, what is less praiseworthy, those of the protagonist of Hesyphasm, Gregory Palamas. A special mention must also be made of the founder of the Academy of Athos, Eugenius Bulgaris. He was born at Corfu in 1716, studied principally at the University of Padua, was preacher of the Church of St. George of the Greeks at Venice, founded, before that of Athos, the School of Janina at Epirus (1742), set out once more for Europe after Cyril V forced him to quit Athos, was recommended by Frederick of Prussia to Catherine II of Russia, was promoted by her to the archbishopric of Kherson in Taurida (which he soon resigned that he might continue his studies), and died at St. Petersburg in 1806. Theologian, exegete, and polemist, Bulgaris was one of the most learned Greeks of the eighteenth century. In his *Theologicon* he follows the scholastic method and places Tournely under contribution, but he is far from drawing nearer to the theology of the Catholic Church. Several of his writings are directed against her, and he had the patience to translate into Greek the enormous and indigestible patristic compilation of the Lutheran Adam Zoernidav on the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone. Many of his works are yet unpublished.[14]

---

[13] The text of the sentence in Mansi, XXXIX, 983–98.

We have almost nothing to say about the three Greek patriarchates of the South during the period we are considering. The see of Alexandria continued to be semititular, its occupants passing the greater part of their time on the Bosphorus: it would not resume activity until a later time, under Mohammet Ali. At Jerusalem it tried to signalize a period of acuteness in the secular struggle between the Greeks and the Latins for the exclusive possession of the holy places. In 1809 the Franciscans were still masters of the shrine of the Holy Sepulcher within the basilica. When the church was damaged by fire, the Greeks rebuilt it; not until 1852 did it again become a common sanctuary. In the patriarchate of Antioch the Greeks, installed to the detriment of the native Melchites by Sylvester of Cyprus (d. 1766), placed themselves on the patriarchal throne and in most of the episcopal sees, without any striking results. The Patriarch Seraphim (1813–23) was, as we are about to see, a persecutor of the Catholic Melchites.

---

[14] See the article by Father Aurelio Palmieri, O.S.A., in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* II, 1236–41.

The Melchite Catholic Church of Antioch

From 1816 to 1833 the patriarchal see of the Catholic Melchites was occupied by Ignatius V Qattan, who, contrary to the customs inaugurated with Cyril VI Tanas in 1724, came from the secular clergy. From being pastor of the village of Zoug-Mikhail in the Lebanon, he passed directly to the patriarchal throne. This election seems to have been owing to a compromise between the two rival congregations of Basilians, the Salvatorians and the Chouerites, which comprised almost the entire hierarchy. This, in turn, had been reduced to four bishops at the time of the election of Ignatius Qattan.

Aleppo remained the most important center of Catholic activity. In 1817 the Orthodox metropolitan, Gerasimus, obtained a decree from Sultan Mahmud which prohibited all missionary endeavors, forbade the Catholics to visit the Latin missioners, and ordered all Melchites to return to the Orthodox obedience. The robbery was complete: the archiepiscopal church, the residence attached to it, and all the property of the diocese passed into Orthodox hands. The Catholic clergy of the Greek rite were condemned to exile. The pasha tried to persuade the people to submit but was not able to obtain anything. Then, influenced by a considerable bribe from Gerasimus, he caused nine young Melchites, a Syrian, and a Maronite to be seized, and all were put to death. These were, however, the only victims. On the other hand, many of the Aleppians emigrated either to the Lebanon, Constantinople, Leghorn, or Marseilles. The Catholic

Melchite clergy were unable to return until much later, when the Egyptian invasion of 1831 and the emancipation of all the Catholic Orientals in the Empire wrested from the Sultan by France, put an end to the violent persecutions.

Gerasimus of Aleppo soon joined Zachary, the Orthodox bishop of Akkar, near Tripoli, and together they journeyed to Damascus to execute their decree. Not much effort was needed to uproot the Melchites there. They had already been despoiled in 1724, and their priests were forced to celebrate Mass in private houses. A decree similar to the first gave the Orthodox patriarch, Seraphin, the same rights over the Catholics of Damascus as Gerasimus of Aleppo had over those of that city.

The procedure followed was the same as at Aleppo: when the judicial decisions were against the Orthodox party, the patriarch obtained with money the degradation and exile of two priests, and a deacon and six notables were condemned to drubbing. Only four survived it; two died under the blows. Large contributions were levied on the Catholics, several of whom apostatized. The priests were at the same time exiled, as at Aleppo. But the isle of Rouad, which is not far from Tripoli and which was designated as the place of their deportation, was subject to the pasha of Acre, who had many Catholic Melchites in his service; they persuaded him to allow the escape of the priests, who were able to take refuge at the convent of the Holy Savior in the Lebanon, where they were in safety. They returned to Damascus only secretly and were not able to resume their ministry until after the death of Seraphin in 1823. Only the Egyptian invasion gave them complete liberty.

From an internal point of view, the Melchite Church continually suffered from the troubled state in which the Jansenist and Gallican doctrines of Germanos Adam had put it. The seminary of Ain-Traz, founded in 1811 by Patriarch Agapius III Matar, had no success. Propaganda closed it in 1815 because the superior, Maximus Mazloum, intruding into the diocese of Aleppo, was too compromising in the affair of the synod of Qarqafe and too favorable to the ideas of Adam. The Basilian congregations, which had rendered so many services during the period of the great persecution of Sylvester, were now exhausted from the troubles that were caused by the repeated intrusions of Ignatius Jauhar in the patriarchal see. The Chouerites in particular had lost their first fervor. Ignatius Sarrouf, the metropolitan of Beirut from 1778 to 1812, had tried to reform them: when nothing came of his efforts, he desired to start a new congregation, but Rome suppressed it for fear that it would merely add to the confusion. The local disputes, which became intense among the Chouerites, had to be settled by a compromise: the Aleppine element separated from the Lebanese element and became another congregation. Propaganda sanctioned the arrangement in 1819. The secular clergy had dwindled to several married priests who were without any sort of education. Nonetheless no attempts to rehabilitate them were made until the following period, but then it was with a celibate clergy.

A division in the congregation of the Antonians among the Maronites had the same causes as that between the Lebanese and Aleppian Chouerites. This separation was not recognized by Benedict XIV, but was finally sanctioned by Clement XIV in 1770. The troubles introduced by the affair of the visionary Hendyye and the lack of observation in the dispositions of the Lebanese synod of 1736 rendered the effects of that assembly little more than nothing, instead of what might have been expected. At last, the patriarch, John Helo, convoked a new synod at the monastery of Louaise, near Beirut, in April, 1818.[15] There the deplorable usage of mixed monasteries of monks and nuns was definitely abolished, and each bishop was assigned a fixed residence. The patriarchal simplicity in which the

[15] See the acts in Mansi, XXXIX, 247–52.

Maronite people lived, as well as the firm hand of the Emir Bechir Checab, prince of Lebanon, lessened the disadvantages of this legislative anarchy which had caused the worst consequences in other countries.

The Syrian Church also went through a troubled period. The Patriarch Michael Jaroué died in 1800; his successor, Michael Daher, a priest of Aleppo, was not elected until 1803, and he resigned eight years later. His successor, Gregory Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, was elected in 1814 and likewise resigned. Rome nominated the archbishop of Aleppo, Denis Hadaia, as the administrator of the patriarchate. Not till 1820 was Gregory Peter Jaroué proclaimed patriarch. He was the bishop of Jerusalem, and under his patriarchate several brilliant conversions took place which gave a new development to this small but heroic Church.

The cause of this eclipse of the real Oriental Churches must be looked for partly in the suppression of the Jesuits. The French government, which had contributed so much to this end, attempted to assign their missions in the Lebanon to the Vincentians, but these were not able to undertake the task, mainly because the Revolution had hindered their growth. The vigor of Catholic life within the Ottoman Empire did not take hold until after the great emancipation of 1931.

The Churches of Eastern Europe

Since Europe had experienced in a special way the effects of the French revolution, we are about to see a whole series of transformations brought about by the new order of things.

At Rome, first of all, the establishment of the Republic in February, 1797, although lasting only a few months, considerably disturbed the administration of Propaganda. The revenues of most of the colleges dependent on it were confiscated, and these colleges remained closed; such was notably the lot of the Greek College and that of Propaganda itself. Cardinal Gerdil, prefect of the congregation, took refuge at Turin, and Cardinal Stefen Borgia, the proprefect, at Padua, in the house of Bishop Speroni of Adria. Both continued to do their best to direct the missions, often in critical circumstances: Borgia was so short of resources that he did not have the means to employ a secretary. This state of affairs continued until the return to Rome, after the Conclave of Venice in 1800. The missions could not remain without a protector in the Ottoman Empire, and as early as 1792 the Holy See turned to Austria, which gladly accepted the function. The situation remained thus until 1803. Moreover, in the past, Propaganda had willingly turned to the emperor for the protectorate over the Catholic Ottoman subjects as often as to France.

Everywhere that the armies of the Directory penetrated, freedom of religion was proclaimed. At Venice, at the time of the Conclave of 1800, the Greeks of St. George, who were Catholics only outwardly, refused to ring their bells, and thus quit the Roman communion. At Ancona the schismatics took possession of the Greek Catholic church and did not give it up until much later, after the restoration of the papal power.

Dalmatia, where the simplicity of a completely patriarchal life preserved the customs of the Middle Ages, contained around 50,000 Orthodox of the Serbian race and nearly five times as many Latin Catholics. The Venetian government, on which the region was dependent, held tightly to the principle of the state religion; the Greeks, as they were called, were considered Catholics, but they paid dues to the Latin clergy, and their rite was regarded as inferior. Propaganda undertook to unite them in a more sincere union, and in 1742 the Bishop of Ossero, who was sufficiently acquainted with literary Slavonic and the Eastern ceremonies, received the privilege of pontificating in that rite in order to perform necessary ordinations.[16] Catholics were ordered to preserve their own rite whenever they had a priest available.

But the Russian influence was large among them; as early as 1759, Maria Theresa authorized, upon the Russian demand, an openly schismatic Church at Trieste.[17] When (May, 1797) Dalmatia was given to Austria after the fall of the Republic of Venice, the Serbs determined to free themselves completely; they were encouraged in this resolve by the metropolitan of Montenegro, Peter Petrovich. After the preliminaries at Leoben and then the Treaty of Campo Formio (October, 1797) had confirmed the existence of Austrian rule, they elected the archimandrite Simeon Ivkovich as bishop, but the new governor, Count von Thurn, let the affair drag on, and the consecration never took place.[18] In February, 1806, the French, after Austerlitz, entered Dalmatia, and the country became part of the Kingdom of Italy. Under the imperial provincial, Vincenzo Dandolo, the most noted personage among the Serbs was the archimandrite Gerasimus Zellich; he was made an equal to the Latin bishops, and by the decree of Saint-Cloud (September 8, 1808) provision was made for the establishment of an Orthodox bishopric, which the synod of Zara organized under the presidency of Dandolo. But Zellich had certain deplorable habits—for instance, he might be found in the street in a drunken state—and he could not be nominated; not until 1810 did the consecration of Bishop Benedict Kraljevich take place. He resided first at Sebenico, then at Castelnuovo, with the title of Zadar. In 1815, Dalmatia was returned to Austria, and the Orthodox bishopric continued to exist, but not until 1870 was it divided and a new eparchy erected at Kotor (Cattaro).[19]

---

[16] See the text of the brief in Raffaele de Martinis, *Ius pontificium de Propaganda Fide,* III, 82.

[17] The documents are in the archives of Propaganda, *Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Greci di Croazia,* Vol. I.

[18] On Dalmatia at this period, consult the excellent work of Father Pisani, *La Dalmatie de 1797 à 1815; Episode des conquêtes napoléoniennes* (1893). The affairs of the Orthodox Serbs occupy pages 84–85, 236–38, 374. See also A. Ratel, "L'Eglise orthodoxe de Dalmatie," in the *Echos d'Orient,* V (1902), 362–75.

I have just mentioned Peter of Montenegro. This tiny Church arose out of the patriarchate of Ipek, and later, from the time of Daniel Petrovich, elected in 1697, out of the archdiocese of Karlovitz, which included various lands of the Ottoman Empire. From uncle to nephew, the metropolitan's see remained hereditary in the Petrovich family till 1858; at that time Daniel Petrovich was secularized and he named as metropolitan Nicanor the archimandrite. Furthermore, after 1830 the Church of Montenegro made itself completely independent of the archbishop of Karlovitz; and its titulars in Belgrade, Dalmatia, and St. Petersburg petitioned for episcopal consecration.

Although the Serbian revolution began in 1806, Serbia proper did not obtain semi-independence until 1830, but the Orthodox Church in that country remained subject to the patriarch of Constantinople until 1879. The Church of the Kingdom of Hungary, fully emancipated, received absolutely complete freedom of worship through the edict of toleration of Joseph II on October 25, 1782. But the obligation which he imposed on all the officials of the Empire in the next year, requiring them to be able to speak and write German fluently within three years, turned everyone against him, the Serbs as well as the Hungarians. The latter, by way of reprisal, suppressed the

---

[19] Bishop Benedict Kraljevich was well disposed in favor of the Union. The Austrian imperial government seconded his views: to train a serious clergy, Kraljevich opened a seminary that he entrusted to four Ruthenian priests of Galicia. But the opposition on the part of the Orthodox party was stronger than he. The victim of an attempted assassination, he had to resign his see in 1829. A decree of that year (March 19) placed the bishopric of Dalmatia subject to the Serbian metropolitan of Karlovitz. Uuder the new bishop, Joseph Rajatchich, three villages passed to the Union in 1831: a violent persecution so lessened the number of the faithful that now they number not more than fifty.

Latin language little by little in all their public acts and replaced it with Hungarian (Magyar), but they were wrong in the attempt to impose their own tongue on all the races inhabiting the same territory as themselves. In 1790–91, the emperor, Leopold II, granted the Serbs civil rights. This was the time when the Serbian monk, Dositheos Obradovich (1739–1811), gave the impulse to modern Serbian literature. Until that time the ecclesiastical idiom, Old Slavonic, was the only one in literary use. In 1792 the archbishop of Karlovitz and his suffragan bishops, as representatives of the Serbian nation, obtained the right to sit in the Hungarian diet, but almost forty years passed before that right came into practical use. In fact, the opposition to this point and to several others was much more political than religious.[20]

Bukovina, reunited to the Austrian Empire in 1775, following the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji of July 21, 1774, had previously formed an Orthodox diocese carved out of the archdiocese of Iassi and Suceava, having the town of Radautz for its see. The change in political rule necessitated the introduction of a change in religious alliance: in 1781 the bishop of Radautz obtained his independence and moved his residence to Tchernovitz. An imperial decree in 1785 placed the bishop of Tchernovitz under the Serbian metropolitan of Karlovitz. This arrangement endured until the emancipation of 1873. But the members of his flock were not Serbian in race or language: a minority were Ruthenian and the majority were Rumanian—a confusion that was matched everywhere in Austria.[21]

---

[20] On the Serbs of Hungary, a good work exists in French, based on Serbian sources and written by Picot, former French consul at Temesvar: *Les Serbes de Hongrie, leur histoire, leurs privilèges, leur état politique et social* (1873). The chief documents touching the privileges of the Serbs of Hungary have been published by P. L. Petit in Mansi, XXXIX. Picot uses especially Orthodox writings and is influenced by his liberal ideas in matters of religion. In his political views he is unfriendly to the Hungarians, and rightly so.

[21] See an article by A. Ratel in the *Echos d'Orient,* V (1902), 232–36, entitled "L'Eglise orthodoxe de Bukovine."

At the head of the Rumanian Church of Transylvania from 1783 to 1830 was John Bobu, born in 1739 at Ormany, in the country of Szolnok in Hungary. Having at first joined the Basilians of Balaszfalva, he abandoned them before his profession, dismayed by the rigorous fasts to which the bishop, Athanasius Rednik, subjected the novices. A secular priest in 1778, he was named bishop of Fagaras by Joseph II in 1782, was confirmed in the appointment by Rome in the following year, and was consecrated by his resigned predecessor, Gregory Major, in 1784. He had some serious difficulties with the Basilians, Gabriel Sinkai, Paul Major, and Samuel Klein, who were the most noted representatives of the Rumanian literary Renaissance of the age. In 1807 he founded a cathedral chapter at Fagaras with the approval of Rome and, after the close of the Napoleonic wars, he convened a diocesan synod at Blas in 1821, which was preparatory to the plenary council of Hungary convoked by the primate of Strigonia, Alexander Rudnay, in 1822. He died (October 2, 1830) at the age of ninety-one after forty-seven years in the episcopate.

The see of Fagaras, erected by Innocent XIII in 1721, comprised all Transylvania, but nothing more. In the Latin diocese of Nagy-Varad (or Gran-Varadin), in Rumanian Oradea-Mare, were also many Rumanians. The zeal of the Latin bishop, Paul Laszlo, led seventy parishes into union with Rome. Bishop Csaky's request that Rome give him an auxiliary of the Greek rite was granted by Benedict XIV to his successor, Paul Forgach of Ghymes, in the person of Melece Kovacs, originally from Macedonia. Kovacs was appointed titular bishop of Tegea by a decree of the Consistory (July 12, 1748). He died in 1770, and Maria Theresa decided upon the erection of an independent Rumanian diocese. She named Moses Dragossy for it on July 26, 1776. At first, Pius VI refused to confirm this measure; but all the difficulties were settled, and the bull *Indefessum personarum* (July 16, 1777) accorded the canonical erection of the see. The new bishop had ordinary jurisdiction over all Rumanians in Hungary living outside of Transylvania, and his metropolitan was the Latin archbishop-primate of Strigonia or Esztergom.

In 1781, Joseph II confirmed the endowment of the see made by Maria Theresa. Moses Dragossy (d. 1787) was succeeded by Ignatius Darabanth (1788–1805), and Samuel Vulcan (1806–39), under whom the see acquired seventy-two parishes which were detached from the Ruthenian eparchy of Munkas by Pius VII. In 1836 Samuel Vulcan opened the still flourishing episcopal gymnasium or college of Belenyes. Under Bishop Basil, baron of Erdelyi (1842–62), numerous conversions seemed to compensate for certain losses caused by the Revolution of 1848. The erection of the Rumanian ecclesiastical province in 1853 brought about some changes once again.[22]

In this review of the Churches of eastern Europe subject to Austria-Hungary, we should not overlook two groups of Latin rite Catholics who were, for the time, either directly or indirectly under the domination of the Turks and who, in our own day, served as a point of support for Catholic propaganda in the Oriental rite. These two groups are the Bulgaro-Walachian mission and the diocese of Bacau in Mildavia.

The Latin Catholics of Bulgaria, or the Pavlikans, are the descendants of ancient Manichaean heretics who were deported into these regions by the Byzantine emperors of the Middle Ages. Those of Philippopolis, for instance, came from Asia Minor. From Bulgaria their doctrines spread throughout eastern Europe and gave birth to the sects known as the Cathari, Albigenses, and so on, quite familiar to the pages of history.

The sect of those called Bogomiles, from the name of a Greek priest who had been their teacher in the tenth century, was condemned by the Bulgarian councils of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. After the Moslem conquest most of them embraced Mohammedanism. Those who remained were converted to Catholicism, but no one knows how or when. In the sixteenth century the popes made them a visitation through the archbishops of Antivari, and later confided them to the Franciscans of Bosnia. The Franciscans also founded the Custody of Bulgaria in their midst, which lasted from 1624 to 1763. From that date till 1781 the Baptistines of Genoa replaced the Bosnian Franciscans within the whole area outside of Walachia itself. In 1781, Pius VI entrusted the diocese of Nicopolis (Rouchtchouk), on the right shore of the Danube, today on the Bulgarian side, to the Passionists. In 1688, the Turks destroyed Chiprovatz, which was the bishop's residence, and a considerable migration set out across the lands of the Empire; it was followed by another in 1724. A third came about in 1812, after an outbreak of the plague; the emigrants crossed the Danube and founded the village of Cioplea in Walachia, close to Bucharest. The Passionist bishop, who had followed the faithful, also decided to reside at Bucharest after 1847. In 1833 Bucharest had been elevated to a Latin archbishopric, and Rouchtchouk became a separate diocese directly dependent on the Holy See.

---

[22] These details are taken from the long and interesting introduction of *Schematismus historicus Venerabilis Cleri Dioecesis Magno-Varadinensis graeci ritus catholicorum pro anno 1900.*

The see of Sofia, detached in 1610 from the Bosnian Franciscans' mission, became an archdiocese in 1643, but the persecutions of the Turks laid it waste during the eighteenth century. In 1835 the Redemptorists established there a prefecture apostolic, which was transformed into a vicariate in 1848, with Italian and Austrian Capuchins after 1841.

In Moldavia, upon the requests of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, Urban V erected a diocese at Sereth in 1370, which was transferred to Bacau after the end of the fifteenth century. It was abandoned in 1497 following the Turkish persecutions, but was re-established at the end of the seventeenth century. As a result of diverse political situations, the right of nomination belonged to the king of Poland; the bishops, all Poles, hardly ever resided in their diocese. In 1818 the see was suppressed, and the Latin Catholics, consisting mostly of Rumanized colonies from Hungary, were confided to the care of regulars. This state of affairs lasted until the establishment of the see of Iassi by Leo XIII in 1884.

The Latin Church within the kingdoms of Bulgaria and Rumania today is represented by four dioceses which are independent of one another: in Bulgaria, the diocese of Bouchtchouk and the vicariate of Sofia; in Rumania, the archdiocese of Bucharest and the privileged diocese of Iassi. In 1823, at the time when this volume closes, the Greek patriarch of Constantinople still extended his jurisdiction over the whole Balkan peninsula, and the Turkish power held sway everywhere either directly or indirectly through the limited vassalage of the principality of Moldavia-Walachia.[23]

The Ruthenian Catholic Church

The Church that was most tried by the transformations of the era we are now studying was the Ruthenian Church.[24]

---

[23] On the Latin Church in Bulgaria, see the article "Bulgarie" in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* II, 1231–36; on the Bogomiles, see the article "Bogomiles," II, 926–30. On the Latin Church of Rumania, see the article under the same title in the *Echos d'Orient,* VI (1903), 42–50, with the important corrections of page 224.

[24] For the history of the Ruthenian Church at this period, see Harasiewicz, *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenicae* (1862), pp. 497 ff.; Julian Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* (1880), II, 495 ff.; Lescœur, *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe* (1772–1875), I, 1–126; Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège* (1902), Vol. V. The last work is of the highest value and abundantly indicates the bibliography of the subject, but it is confined to the relations with Rome. Harasiewicz, a Ruthenian author of doubtful erudition, is animated by an excessively anti-Polish spirit; Pelesz, also Ruthenian, is too Polish. In these questions to maintain a just middle course is indeed hard. In truth, the history of the Ruthenian Church is still to be written. Consult also the work of Father Theiner, *Die Neusten Zustande der katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katharine II bis auf unsere Tage* (1847); this work has been translated into

On the eve of the partition of Poland in 1772, the Ruthenian hierarchy included eight eparchies or effective dioceses: Kiev, the theoretical seat of the metropolitan, although, after the return of that city to Russia in 1667, he resided by turns at Vilna, Novgorod, and finally at Radomychl in Ukrainia; Polotsk, Vladimir in Volynia, Loutsk, Lvov or Leopol (Lemburg), Peremychl, Kholm, and Pinsk. These eight dioceses counted around 13,000 parishes, large and small, and a Catholic Ruthenian population which amounted to about 5,000,000 souls.[25]

The first partition of Poland (1772) placed a part of White Russia and a good piece of the archdiocese of Polotsk under the scepter of Catherine II of Russia; under that of Austria went the eparchies of Peremychl and Lvov, except the district of Kamenietz-Podolsk. The sections taken by Russia were within the solidly Polish region of the kingdom.

The second partition (1793) gave Russia almost the whole metropolitan eparchy, the district of Kamenietz-Podolsk from Lvov on, the eastern part of the diocese of Loutsk, the city of Pinsk with nearly all the territory of the diocese, and finally the remainder of the eparchy of Podolsk. At the third partition (1795), which was only a continuation of the first, Russia received the rest of the eparchies of Loutsk and Pinsk and the whole eparchy of Vladimir in Volynia. Likewise, in 1795, Austria received the territory of Kholm. In 1793 Russia had taken over Great Poland, a completely Polish district, but in

---

French and Italian, but the German edition is the best because it contains documents that are lacking in the translations. See also, though with caution in what concerns the Jesuits, *L'histoire de Clement XIV,* by the same author.

[25] Each bishop could have one or more coadjutors, who were then decorated with the title of some city in the eparchy, sometimes itself a former episcopal see: this institution is to be found in the Russian non-Catholic Church and in the Rumanian Church. To Polotsk were thus attached the ancient sees of Vitebsk, Mscislav, Orcha, and Moghilev; to Vladimir, Brest-Litovskij; to Loutsk, Ostrog; to Leopol, Galitch and Mamenietz-Podolskij; to Peremychl, Sanok and Sambor; to Kholm, Belz; to Pinsk, Tourov.

1795 she added Mozaria and a part of Lithuania with it: a good many Ruthenians who were thus left without their bishop (of Vladimir and Brest) might be found in the latter region.

The Treaty of Tilsit in 1807 set up the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, which lasted under a form of independence until the treaties of 1815. The eparchy of Kholm was included therein, even though the Lithuanian portion was ceded to Russia in 1795. In 1815 Kholm passed to Russia. The Ruthenian Church then found itself placed under the authority of two sovereigns: the czar of Russia and the emperor of Austria. Except for Red Russia, of which Galicia is a part, the czar regained possession of all the domains over which the old Russian princes of Riourik had ruled.

The political causes for the fall of the Polish kingdom are well known. The nation perished a victim of its anarchical constitution[26] and the unscrupulous ambition of King Frederick II of Prussia. Together these two things forced the hand of Maria Theresa.

From a religious point of view, divorce had reached an unheard-of frequency in Poland—to such an extent that various ambiguous clauses which made separation on the plea of nullity very easy were inserted into the marriage contract. The clergy, unfortunately, too often approved of these maneuvers. The population was once again reduced to a servile state, and the Ruthenians, who formed nearly half of the population, were continually victims of various incurable prejudices that retarded their progress. The children of Ruthenian priests were legally no better than serfs. The Catholic bishops of the Greek rite could not take a seat in the Senate, where the Latin prelates were admitted by law—the metropolitan himself did not obtain a seat until the close of the Republic in 1789. Transfer to the Latin rite became more and more frequent in the upper classes owing to the lack of legislation which Rome had desired to enforce ever since 1624, but which had been refrained from because of opposition from the king and the ecclesiastical authorities.

---

[26] Poland was an elective and representative monarchy. Between one reign and another, the power was exercised by the archbishop primate of Gnesen until the electoral diet. Often the period was one of anarchy. The laws were voted by the diet, but the principle of the *liberum veto* could prevent their application: a protest of a few nobles, publicly recorded, was enough to halt everything. The king had merely the executive power.

From an internal point of view, the whole effectiveness of the Ruthenian Church rested with the Basilians. They alone were educated since they alone had theological schools and were free from the dominance of the landed nobility. All the bishops were recruited from their ranks, and the Council of Zamosc in 1720 passed a law requiring every secular priest who was called to the episcopate to make monastic profession before his consecration.[27] Since a general belief prevailed at that time that such was the true discipline of the Eastern Church, Rome had confirmed the measure. The religious were everything: they occupied the important positions in the diocesan curias and cathedral chapters—an institution evidently of Latin origin but one which had been firmly established since before the Union of Brest in 1595.

As for the secular clergy, they were almost all married, deprived of seminaries in spite of all the efforts to remedy that need, chained to the soil which they often worked with their own hands, and regarded as low and commonplace by the upper classes. The best secular clergy, and the only ones that were generally celibate, were students of the pontifical colleges of Lvov and Vilna. But often they would despair of improving their lot and entered the Basilians upon completing their studies.

This preponderance of the Basilians, which was abnormal in a country where the secular clergy had been at the peak of its task, was the cause of a good many of the troubles, especially after the middle of the eighteenth century, that beset this Church.

---

[27] When the rule finally became the exception, the Council of Leopol in 1891 abolished the decree of Zamosc.

To improve the secular clergy, they needed to be assured of equality with the Latin clergy before the civil law of the state, to be given seminaries, and to be rendered celibate little by little. This change supposed a compromise between different factors that could not or would not support any reforms.

Not only through corrupt morals and the frequency of divorce had the Polish nobility been infected, but the skepticism introduced by the circulation of the writings of the French philosophers caused ravages among the members of that group along with the others. Freemasonry had also been introduced into the kingdom, and, if some of the bishops did perhaps stand up against it, they did not always do their duty in this regard. Finally, the bishop of Vilna, Ignatius Massalski, was responsible for having placed in the upper hierarchy a Calvinist of imperfect conversion, Stanislas Siestrzencewicz of Bohusz, who would be at the head of the Latin rite in Russia for half a century and who would conduct himself in all matters in accord with the principles of purest Febronianism.

The pretext invented by Frederick II of Prussia and Catherine of Russia for intervening in Polish affairs and preparing the partition of the country was the question of the dissidents, the Protestants and the Ruthenian schismatics. In the sixteenth century, the Jesuits, working with a less corrupt society, had been able to check the former and they converted a large number. Unfortunately, to continue this work took all their effort.

With regard to the Ruthenians who had not yet embraced the Union, the ease with which Ukrania, the citadel of schism in the old days, had been won by Catholicism indicated that the same procedure would have been used in White Russia, if the fault of permitting the establishment of the diocese of Moghilev, which became the center of ceaseless agitation for Russian intervention, had not been committed. The abandonment of the Ruthenian Church by the Polish people was one of the chief causes for the fall of their nation.

At the time of the first partition, the metropolitan of Kiev was Felician Volodkovitch (1762–78). A projected synod could not be held, and various accusations which have not been made clear even in our own time caused the metropolitan to resign all jurisdiction over his own eparchy and over the eparchy of Vladimir, which he governed as administrator. The former was entrusted to the care of Leo Cheptitskij, the bishop of Lvov, and the latter to Anthony Mlodovskij, the bishop of Brest and coadjutor of the diocese of Vladimir. The king of Poland, Stanislas Augustus Poniatowski, was very active in having the arrangement confirmed by Rome, and the Holy See, after learning all the details of the affair, gave its approval. This affair was not ended until 1774—Volodkovitch died in 1778. His successor was Leo Cheptitskij, bishop of Lvov, but only for the space of one year, for he died at the end of 1780. Jason Smogorjevskij, archbishop of Polotsk, was elected in his place and passed again under Polish domination in order to take possession of his see. Dead in 1786, he had Theodosius Rostotskij, the bishop of Kholm and his coadjutor, for his successor. Around the time of the third partition of Poland, he was held in semi-captivity at St. Petersburg, where he died in 1805. The Ruthenian Church was, except for the ancient eparchies, established in Hungary, which had always had a separate existence, divided into three parts, between Prussia, Russia, and Austria.

In Prussia, first of all, the division of the eparchy of Brest-Vladimir, which had fallen under that power, reinforced the archimandrate of Suprasl which dated from a foundation of the metropolitan of Kiev, Joseph Soltan, in 1553. On March 4, 1798, Pius VI elevated Suprasl to a Ruthenian diocese and named Theodosius Vitotskij, the archimandrite of the monastery, as its first bishop, from the Carthusian monastery in

Florence where the Roman Republic had forced the pope to take refuge.

The king of Prussia assured the new bishop and also his cathedral chapter of a considerable endowment. Vitotskij died around 1805, and his successor, Douchnovskij, followed him to the grave before being able to obtain episcopal consecration. In 1807, by the Treaty of Tilsit, the territory of this short-lived eparchy passed to Russia, and no Ruthenians were any longer left in Prussia.

The Catholic Church in Russia

In Russia the treaty signed by Catherine II in 1793 following the first partition of Poland granted expressly the exercise of their religion to the Catholics of both rites. But Catherine did not respect this article of the treaty any more than she did the others.

Already since 1766 she had been intervening in the affairs of the Latin Catholic community in St. Petersburg at the request of some of its members. Formerly this community had been dependent on Propaganda through the intermediary of the nuncio of Warsaw or Vienna, but after this time, on account of the many law suits between the clergy and the faithful —and the divisions between them had not a little to do with the affair—it was to be dependent on the College at St. Petersburg and, in a way, on the Ministry of Justice. The regulations of 1769, never approved by the Holy See, were the embodiment of all the legislation that regulated the Catholic Church of both rites in Russia.

The Latin dioceses of Poland had been dismembered just as the Ruthenian eparchies were after the partitions.[28] In 1772, an imperial decree of December 14 determined the lot of Latin and Ruthenian Catholics without the least taking note of the authority of the Holy See. As it was, Catherine applied the principles of Febronianism in all cases and the archbishop whom she herself installed and whom Rome was forced to recognize was not one to turn her from its maxims.

---

[28] The Latin dioceses in Poland comprise seventeen sees: Gnesen (primatial see), Leopol (archbishopric), Kamenietz, Chelm (Kholm), Cujavie, Culm, Kiev, Cracow, Luck (Loutsk), Plock, Posen, Peremychl, Samogitie, Smolensk, Varmie, Pilten. and Vilna. Each can have a coadjutor, who is called suffragan.

After this decree all communication with the Holy See was forbidden unless it passed through government channels. The whole Empire would have but one Latin diocese, and all religious without exception would be subject to it: legislation from St. Petersburg in 1769 rendered it exactly thus. As for the titular of this immense diocese which included all European and Asiatic Russia, he was not named for some time. With regard to the Ruthenians, since the archbishop of Polotsk, at that time Jason Smogorjevskij, had his residence in Russian territory, the decree conferred on him the same authority for his own rite as it had on the Latin bishop.

Massalski's protégé, Siestrzencewicz,[29] obtained the necessary bulls from Rome to become the suffragan of Vilna within Russian territory through his donor's influence—Massalski always tried to be *persona grata* to Catherine. Consecrated titular bishop of Mallo on October 1, 1773, he departed almost immediately for St. Petersburg. He had the confidence of the Polish nuncio, Garampi, as well as that of Massalski and Catherine II, and not long afterward his true feelings were discovered at Rome. Since Catherine did not wish to deal with the pope personally, she charged Siestrzencewicz with all negotiations with the Holy See, and, without giving more attention to the matter, named him bishop of Moghilev in White Russia by decree of November 22, 1773. Having the welfare of souls in mind and not suspecting anything, Clement XIV recognized the usurper of the powers binding upon all the Latin Catholics in the Empire.

---

[29] This unlucky man, who governed the Latin Church in Russia from 1774 to 1826, that is, for half a century, was a Lithuanian of the lower nobility, born a Calvinist, became a volunteer in the Prussian army, was wounded either in war or in a duel; he was converted at Berlin after his wound—according to some, following a love romance; at the home of the Radziwills, say others. He was a student at Berlin and at Frankfort, then tutor of the children of Martin Radziwill and was named an officer in the Lithuanian guards. Ignace Massalski, his protector, bishop of Vilna, was a worldly prelate, such as many were in Poland of that time. He was a passionate gambler, always short of funds in spite of an immense fortune, a great builder of churches, and concerned with spreading instruction in the popular masses. He is the one who pushed Siestrzencewicz into holy orders about 1764, and then made him canon of Vilna, pastor of Bobruisk, and *ad interim* administrator of the diocese. At the time of the 1794 revolution, Massalski was massacred by the populace because of his Russophile tendencies. Stanislas Siestrzencewicz died December 1, 1826, at the age of ninety-six.

At Rome no way out of this inextricable situation could be found. Between times, hundreds of parishes in Ukrainia had been snatched from union by measures in which violence played a great part. Later, four schismatic eparchies were erected in the territories obtained at the second and third partitions of Poland. An attempt at mediation by Maria Theresa met with no success whatever. Jason Smogorjevskij was elected metropolitan in 1780, and just as he resided in Poland, his successor, Bishop Maximilian Ryllo of Kholm, preferred to live in Austria. Therefore Catherine entrusted the administration of the see to a consistory. Thus the Ruthenians no longer had any hierarchy, and the Latins had a bishop who was only canonically supplied with binding faculties.

In 1780 Pius VI himself wrote to Catherine to ask for the nomination of a Ruthenian bishop. Catherine answered him by calling in turn for the erection of Moghilev into an archdiocese and the pallium for Siestrzencewicz, with a coadjutor in addition. Since the Pope delayed on account of an injuction which Siestrzencewicz had issued and which the Pope wished him to retract, Catherine named her protégé archbishop of Moghilev by a decree of January 17–28, 1782, illegally conferred on him ample powers over the religious, and gave him the former

Jesuit, Benislawski, for coadjutor. The organization of the archdiocese and the installation followed at once, and Siestrzencewicz consented to it all.

This period in the history of the Catholic Church in Russia is linked too much with that of the Jesuits not to say a short word about it here. The brief of Clement XIV, *Dominus ac Redemptor,* had to be published in each diocese in order to accomplish its purpose. Catherine, who needed the Jesuits for the education of the nation's youth and who was well acquainted with their superior methods, formally forbade Siestrzencewicz to publish the brief. The Jesuits in White Russia, where their college at Polotsk had been famous for a long time, were thus held together. The ill will of the Bishop of Mallo toward the Society gave way before the will of the Empress, but at the Vatican the publication of the brief was insisted on under pressure from the Bourbon courts. In reality, Pius VI had desired to save the Jesuits and he was delighted from the first by the opening of a novitiate at Polotsk—with the consent of Siestrzencewicz, but forced by the Empress in the meantime. The Pope indicated this fact to Benislawski in several significant conversations when the latter came to Rome to hasten the negotiations while the Russian ambassador at Warsaw, Stackelburg, pressed the nuncio, Archetti, more and more.

Moreover, Archetti desired the mission to Catherine with which he was entrusted at the end of 1783. He arrived in St. Petersburg in July, and was well received there by the Empress, who flattered herself with having vanquished the pope. Actually, the desire to save the 12,000,000 Catholics of both rites in Russia from the evident menace of the autocracy had caused Pius VI to overlook the repeated and pressing demands for the suppression of the Jesuits from the Bourbon courts.

At the end of December, 1783, Archetti canonically erected the archdiocese of Moghilev by means of cleverly drawn-up official acts in a way to safeguard the pope's rights, and shortly afterward Heraclius Lissovskij was lawfully enthroned in the Ruthenian see of Polotsk. After a stay of eleven months in Russia, Archetti returned to Poland in order to receive the red hat, which his Russian mission and the renewed esteem of Catherine for the Pope had earned for him. The Empress had desired the same favor for Siestrzencewicz, but this time Pius VI was immovable.

After the third partition of Poland, Catherine erected three new Latin dioceses in her own domains, at Livonia, Pinsk, and Latychev, upon the ruins of the former sees without referring to the Pope, and she placed all the Ruthenians under the archbishop of Polotsk. Her purpose was to destroy the united Church bit by bit. She would undoubtedly have accomplished this purpose if death had not carried her off in 1796.

Her son, Paul I, was as tolerant as his mother was intolerant. A stay at Rome in 1782 filled him with veneration for the Pope, Pius VI, and he protected the Jesuits and held them in high regard. The coronation of the new emperor and his good disposition greatly facilitated the mission to St. Petersburg of Msgr. Lorenzo Litta, the nuncio at Warsaw in 1797. The following year, after some negotiations which had at times been rather difficult because Paul held strongly to his autocratic power in spite of his benevolence, a series of decrees from Litta organized the Catholic Church in Russia on a regular basis. The diocese of Moghilev retained its vast territory, but it was given two suffragans: one at St. Petersburg and one at Moghilev. Siestrzencewicz became the metropolitan of all the Latin Churches in the Empire, and for himself and his successors obtained the privilege of wearing red garb. Within the recently annexed provinces, five bishoprics were either confirmed or established: Vilna (with four suffragans), Loutsk-Jitomir, Kamenietz-Podolsk, and Minsk. None of Litta's decrees provided for the Ruthenians, still he did not overlook them entirely, for he obtained two new sees in their favor: Loutsk and Brest Litovsk. Unfortunately the affair at Malta, too complicated to be recounted here,[30] caused Msgr. Litta's disgrace at the court and he had to quit Russia in 1799.

Yet his achievements endured. Paul I continued to protect the Jesuits, and asked the pope to formally recognize them at the very time when negotiations for uniting the Russian and Roman Churches were being opened by Father Gruber as intermediary. Paul's assassination during a palace revolution (March 11–23, 1801) put an end to everything. In spite of his fanciful character, great things might have been expected from an emperor who had enough insight to banish the unworthy Siestrzencewicz and replace him with Benislawski.

Alexander I

Siestrzencewicz returned with the accession of Alexander I. The new czar, an adherent of liberal ideas, showed himself well disposed toward the Jesuits, but he let himself be taken in by the cleverness of the metropolitan archbishop of Moghilev, who had resigned his see. The Emperor showed that he was being influenced at the creation of the Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical College in 1801. This college replaced the former department in the Ministry of Justice and had the last word in the administration of the Catholic Church in Russia. It consisted of nine ecclesiastical members, three of whom were permanent (the archbishop of Moghilev and two assistants named by the college with imperial approval), and six others who were named for a term of three years by each of the six Latin dioceses. The arrangement had nothing to do with the Ruthenians.

This disastrous influence of Siestrzencewicz also served to hinder Msgr. Arezzo's mission to St. Petersburg in 1803. He

[30] Cf. Pierling, pp. 255 ff.

was interested in settling the question over the right to nominate the bishops, a thing which Litta had not been able to decide, and in regulating the status of the Ruthenians. They had obtained four sees with double representation in the College in 1802, but with a direct right of appeal to the Senate, a solidly schismatic body of legislators—a right which was not without some danger. The deplorable Vernegues affair,[31] which had the air of placing the Holy See in conflict with Russia over a question having to do with a French conspirator, put an end to Msgr. Arezzo's mission in 1804. With such a man as Siestrzencewicz as head of the Catholic College, correspondence with Rome necessarily became more and more difficult. At any rate, soon after Arezzo's departure, the bishops were again forbidden to contact Rome unless through government channels.

The last metropolitan of Kiev, Theodosius Rostotskij, died at St. Petersburg on January 25, 1805, after obtaining, in his last days, permission to resume his metropolitan jurisdiction. On July 24, 1806, Alexander I named Heraclius Lissovskij metropolitan of the Uniate Churches of Russia, just as Siestrzencewicz was of the Latin Churches. Of course, Rome had no voice in the affair. Since the treaty of Tilsit had reunited the eparchy of Suprasl to Russia, it was returned to the eparchy of Brest, and Leo Javoroskij was consecrated suffragan of Brest with the title of bishop of Vladimir in Volynia at a later date. Lissovskij fixed his residence at Vilna and he had a suffragan in the person of Adrian Golovnia, with the title of bishop of Orcha. At his death (August 30, 1809) he was succeeded by Gregory Kokhanovitch (1809–15), bishop of Loutsk.

The Ruthenian hierarchy in Russia, therefore, comprised the metropolitan see of Vilna with a suffragan at Orcha, the see of Polotsk with the rank of an archbishopric, the diocese of

---

[31] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 401 ff.

Loutsk, and the diocese of Brest with a suffragan at Vladimir. Lissovskij had no papal confirmation for his elevation to the dignity of metropolitan, nor did Kokhanovitch, and without this confirmation they were not able to consecrate new bishops. Since recourse to Rome was not possible for definite reasons, Kokhanovitch made use of epikeia. A written declaration recognizing all the rights of the Roman Pontiff was sent to Rome through the nuncio at Vienna, and three new bishops were consecrated. This same procedure was followed in 1817, after the death of Kokhanovitch, when Josaphat Boulghak succeeded him. Circumstances forced matters to be arranged as best they could. At the death of Alexander in 1825, Catholic Ruthenians along the frontiers of the Empire officially numbered 1,427,559. Thanks to the tolerance of Paul I, of Alexander, and of Nicholas I during the first years of his reign, the Ruthenians counted a million and a half ten years later.

In 1815, several conversions made by the Jesuits in high Russian society led to their expulsion from the Empire. But henceforth the storms against the Society were a thing of the past: miraculously preserved in Russia, they went forth from there and established themselves anew throughout the world.[32]

Alexander passed his last few days (November 19 to December 1, 1825) at Taganrog on the Sea of Azov. Ever since 1812 some mysterious attachment had been bringing him closer and closer to the Catholic Church. He showed himself so sincere that he entered into relations with Pope Leo XII the very year of his death and petitioned the papal envoy in Russia for a priest appointed by the Pope, who would prepare the way for his conversion. We are almost absolutely certain that Alexander I died desiring in his heart communion with the Church of Rome, if he did not have the ministrations of a Catholic priest at his deathbed.[33]

---

[32] On the Jesuits of Russia, the most accessible work is that of Father Stanislas Zalenski, *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche.* On the conversions that brought about their expulsion, see the interesting *Vie du P. Marc Folloppe* by Father Gagrine (1877), pp. 34 ff.

We must say a few words about the part of the Ruthenian Church that passed under Austrian rule. Here, at least, was no fear of violence. Maria Theresa was full of good will toward the Ruthenians. In 1774 she erected a central seminary at Vienna, close to the Ruthenian church of St. Barbara, which was intended for subjects from the Galacian eparchies. At the same time the Ruthenian clergy were put on an equal footing with the Latin clergy. The queer ideas entertained by Joseph II (1780–90) were felt as much in Galacia as anywhere else: the magnificent pontifical college at Leopol for Ruthenians and Armenians was closed down and replaced by one of the Emperor's notorious general seminaries, which, in this case, cast Latins, Ruthenians, Armenians, Rumanians, and Serbs together into one confused lot. Political changes caused the addition of new districts to the eparchies of Leopol and Peremychl, but everything was done with the regular approval of the lawful metropolitan, Jason Smogorjevskij. Francis II (1792–1835) likewise respected Theodosius Rostotskij's authority over the eparchies of Leopol, Peremychl, and Kholm, after the partition of 1795. In 1802, Pius VII once again most explicitly forbade the passage from one rite to another without the permission of the Holy See, as a consequence of new quarrels caused by a movement to the contrary which had been undertaken by the Polish clergy. This body proved itself to be no more broadminded in regard to the Greek rite in Russia or Austria than it had been in what had once been Poland.

In 1805 the Ruthenian procurator at Rome, Father Jourdan Mitskievitch, took steps toward the restoration of the former metropolitan see of Galitch. Following the death of the bishops of Peremychl and Kholm, the new bishop of Peremychl remained a sole administrator of the Ruthenians in Austria. Eight days before the calends of March, 1807, Pius VII issued the bull *In universalis ecclesiae,* restoring the metropolitan diocese of Galitch. Situated in territory belonging to the eparchy of Leopol, Galitch was united with that archbishopric, and Peremychl and Kholm became its suffragans. Anthony Anghelovitch became the first metropolitan of Galacia.

---

[33] This question is studied in all its details by Father Pierling in an interesting pamphlet, *Empereur Alexandre 1er est-il mort catholique?* (1901).

The treaties of 1815 passed Kholm over to Russia. Anthony Anghelovitch had died in the previous year and was succeeded in 1818 by Michael Levitskij, who would die a cardinal. His story belongs to the following period.[34]

---

[34] The Ruthenians of Austria at this period might have amounted to two million. Their number is now more that double that number.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Declaration of the Rights of Man (at the head of the Constitution of 1791)

THE representatives of the French people, constituted in national assembly, considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man are the only cause of public evils and the corruption of governments, have resolved to set forth, in a solemn declaration, the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of man to the end that this declaration, perpetually present to all the members of the social body, will ceaselessly remind them of their rights and duties; that the acts of the legislative power and those of the executive power may be at all times compared with the demands of the citizens and henceforth based on simple and incontestable principles, may always be directed to the maintenance of the Constitution and the welfare of all.

Hence the National Assembly acknowledges and declares, in the presence of and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following rights of man and of the citizen.

Article 1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions can be based only on the common usefulness.

Article 2. The purpose of every political association is the preservation of the natural and inalienable rights of man. These rights are liberty, ownership of property, safety, and resistance to oppression.

Article 3. The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation; no body and no individual can exercise any authority which does not expressly emanate therefrom.

Article 4. Liberty consists in being able to do whatever does not injure another: thus the exercise of each man's natural rights has no bounds but those which assure to the other members of society the enjoyment of these same rights. These bounds can be determined only by the law.

Article 5. The law has the right to forbid only actions that are harmful to society. Whatever is not forbidden by law may not be hindered and no one may be constrained to do what the law does not ordain.

Article 6. The law is the expression of the general will. All the citizens have the right to participate in its formation either personally or through their representatives. This law must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in its eyes, are likewise eligible to all public offices, places, and employments, according to their capacity, with no distinctions but their virtues and talents.

Article 7. No one may be accused, arrested, or detained except in the cases determined by the law and in accordance with the forms it has prescribed. Those who solicit, dispatch, execute or have executed arbitrary orders should be punished; but every citizen summoned or seized in virtue of the law must promptly obey: by resistance he renders himself culpable.

Article 8. The law should establish only penalties that are strictly and evidently necessary, and no one may be punished except in virtue of a law established and promulgated previous to the offense and legally applied.

Article 9. Everyone being presumed innocent until he has been declared guilty, if it is judged indispensable to arrest him, all rigor not necessary for assuring his person must be severely repressed by the law.

Article 10. No one is to be troubled for his opinions, even religious opinions, provided their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law.

Article 11. The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of man's most precious rights; every citizen, therefore, may speak, write, and print freely, except that he must be held responsible for the abuse of this freedom in the cases determined by the law.

Article 12. The guaranty of the rights of man and the citizen requires a public force: this force, then, is instituted for the benefit of all, and not for the particular advantage of those to whom it is entrusted.

Article 13. For the maintenance of the public forces and for the expenses of administration, a common contribution is indispensable; it should be shared equally by all the citizens, on the basis of their ability to contribute to it.

Article 14. All citizens have the right to determine, by themselves or through their representatives, the need of the public contribution, freely to agree to it, to watch over its collection, and to determine its amount, its assessment, its collection, and its duration.

Article 15. Society has the right to require from every public agent an accounting of his administration.

Article 16. Every society in which the guaranty of rights is not assured and the separation of powers is not determined is to be regarded as not constituted.

Article 17. Ownership being an inviolable and sacred right, no one can be deprived of it except when public necessity, lawfully established, evidently so requires, and under the condition of a just and previous indemnity.

APPENDIX II

The French Concordat of 1801

The government of the Republic recognizes that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is the religion of the great majority of French citizens.

His Holiness recognizes that this same religion has derived and expects even more at this time the greatest splendor from the establishment of Catholic worship in France and from the special profession of that religion by the consuls of the Republic.

Wherefore, in accordance with this mutual recognition, for the good of religion as also for the maintenance of internal tranquillity, they have covenanted as follows:

Article 1. The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion will be freely exercised in France. Its worship will be public, in conformity with the police regulations that the government will judge necessary for public tranquillity.

Article 2. In concert with the government, the Holy See will make a new circumscription of the French dioceses.

Article 3. The Supreme Pontiff will declare to the titulars of the Churches of France that he expects from them, with firm confidence, for the sake of peace and unity, every kind of sacrifice, even that of their episcopal sees.

If, after this exhortation, they refuse to make this sacrifice sought for the good of the Church (a refusal which, however, His Holiness does not expect), provision will be made, by new titulars, for the government of the bishoprics of the new circumscription, in the following manner.

Article 4. The first consul of the Republic, within three months following the publication of the bull of His Holiness, will nominate to the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the new circumscription. His Holiness will confer canonical institution according to the forms established in relation to France before the change of government.

Article 5. Nominations to the bishoprics that will become vacant subsequently will likewise be made by the first consul, and the canonical institution will be given by the Holy See, in conformity with the preceding article.

Article 6. Before entering upon their office, the bishops shall make directly into the hands of the first consul the oath of fidelity that was in use before the change of government, expressed in the following terms.

"I swear and promise to God, upon the holy Gospels, to keep obedience and fidelity to the government established by the Constitution of the French Republic. I promise also to entertain no knowledge, to participate in no counsel, to enter into no league, whether internal or external, which may be contrary to the public tranquillity; and if, in my diocese or elsewhere, I learn that anything is being contrived to the prejudice of the State, I will make the same known to the government."

Article 7. The ecclesiastics of the second order will take the same oath in the hands of the civil authorities designated by the government.

Article 8. At the end of the divine office the following prayer will be recited in all the Catholic churches of France:

"Domine, salvam fac Rempublicam; Domine, salvos fac Consules."

Article 9. The bishops will make a new circumscription of the parishes of their dioceses, which will go into effect only after the consent of the government.

Article 10. The bishops will appoint the curés. Their choice will designate only persons approved by the government.

Article 11. The bishops may have a chapter in their cathedral and a seminary for their diocese, without the government being obliged to endow these.

Article 12. All metropolitan churches, cathedrals, parish churches, and others, not alienated, will be put at the disposition of the bishops.

Article 13. His Holiness, for the sake of peace and the happy re-establishment of the Catholic religion, declares that neither he nor his successors will in any way disturb those who have acquired alienated ecclesiastical property; consequently the ownership of these same properties, together with the rights and revenues attached thereto, will remain indefeasible in their hands and those of their assigns.

Article 14. The government will assure a suitable support (salary) to the bishops and the curés whose dioceses and parishes will be embraced in the new circumscription.

Article 15. The government will likewise adopt measures so that French Catholics, if they so wish, may make foundations in favor of the churches.

Article 16. His Holiness recognizes in the first consul of the French Republic the same rights and prerogatives as those enjoyed in relation to him by the former government.

Article 17. It is agreed between the contracting parties that, in the event that any of the successors of the first consul should not be Catholic, the rights and prerogatives mentioned in the foregoing article and the appointment to the bishoprics, will be regulated with regard to him by a new convention.

Organic Articles of the Concordat of 1801

Title I

Of the governance of the Catholic Church in its general relations with the rights and police of the State

1. No bull, brief, decree, mandate, appointment, signature in lieu of appointment, nor other dispatches from the court of Rome, even concerning merely individuals, can be received, published, printed, or otherwise put into execution without the authorization of the government.

2. No individual calling himself nuncio, legate, apostolic vicar or commissioner, or availing himself of any other title, may, without the same authorization, exercise on French soil or elsewhere any function relative to the affairs of the Gallican Church.

3. The decrees of foreign synods, even of general councils, may not be published in France before the government has examined their form, their conformity with the laws, rights, and liberties of the French Republic, and whatever, in their publication, might alter or concern the public tranquillity.

4. No national or metropolitan council, no diocesan synod, and no deliberative assembly can be held without the express permission of the government.

5. All ecclesiastical functions shall be gratis, save for the offerings that will be authorized and fixed by the regulations.

6. Recourse will be had to the Council of State in all cases of abuse on the part of superiors and other ecclesiastical persons.

Cases of abuse are: the usurpation of authority or excess by the power, contravention of the laws and regulations of the Republic, infraction of the rules consecrated by the canons received in France, attacks on the liberties, privileges, and customs of the Gallican Church, and any undertaking or procedure that, in the exercise of worship, may compromise the honor of the citizens, arbitrarily disturb their conscience, or degenerate into oppression or injury of them, or into public scandal.

7. Likewise recourse will be had to the Council of State if offense is offered to the public exercise of religion and to the freedom which the laws and regulations guarantee to its ministers.

8. The recourse is available to any person concerned. In the absence of complaints by a private person, it will be made *ex officio* by the prefects.

The public official, the ecclesiastic, or the person who wishes to take recourse, will address a detailed and signed memorial to the Counselor of the State charged with all affairs concerning public worship. He must, with the shortest delay, take note of all suitable information. On his report, the affair will be continued and finally terminated in the administrative form or, according to the requirement of the case, referred to the competent authorities.

Title II

Of the ministers

Section 1. General provisions

9. Catholic worship will be carried out under the direction of the archbishops and bishops in their dioceses, and under that of the curés in their parishes.

10. Every privilege bearing exemption from the episcopal jurisdiction is abolished.

11. The archbishops and bishops, with the authorization of the government, may establish in their dioceses cathedral chapters and seminaries. All other ecclesiastical establishments are suppressed.

12. Archbishops and bishops are free to add to their name the title of Citizen or that of Monsieur. All other titles are forbidden.

Section 2. Archbishops or metropolitans

13. The archbishops will consecrate and install their suffragans. In case they are hindered or refuse, their place will be taken by the senior bishop of the metropolitan district.

14. They will watch over the maintenance of the faith and discipline in the dioceses dependent on their archiepiscopal see.

15. They will take cognizance of the claims and complaints brought against the conduct and decisions of the suffragar bishops.

Section 3. Bishops, vicars general, and seminaries

16. No one may be appointed bishop before the age of thirty years and unless he is of French birth.

17. Before the expedition of the decision of nomination, he or those proposed will be obliged to bear a testimonial of good life and morals, to be sent by the bishop in whose diocese they have exercised the office of ecclesiastical minister. And they shall be examined on their doctrine by a bishop and two priests, who will be commissioned by the first consul, and these shall report the result of their examination to the Counselor of State charged with all matters concerning public worship.

18. The priest named by the first consul will promptly report the institution by the pope.

He may not exercise any function before the bull of institution has received the sanction of the government and he has in person taken the oath prescribed by the convention entered into between the French government and the Holy See.

This oath will be taken before the first consul; the official document will be drawn up by the Secretary of State.

19. The bishops will appoint and institute the curés. However, they will not make known their appointment and will not give canonical institution until the appointment has been approved by the first consul.

20. They will be held to residence in their dioceses. They may leave their dioceses only with permission of the first consul.

21. Each bishop may appoint two vicars general, and each archbishop may appoint three. They will select them from the priests having the qualifications for becoming bishops.

22. Every year they will personally make a visitation of part of their diocese, and in the space of five years the entire diocese. In case of lawful hindrance, the visitation will be made by a vicar general.

23. The bishops will be charged with the organization of their seminaries, and the rules of this organization will be submitted to the approval of the first consul.

24. Those who will be chosen for teaching in the seminaries will subscribe to the declaration made by the clergy of France in 1682 and published by the edict of the same year. They will agree to teach there the doctrine contained in that edict. The bishops will send a form of this agreement to the Counselor charged with all the affairs concerning public worship.

25. The bishops will every year send to the Counselor of State the names of persons studying in the seminaries and destined for the ecclesiastical state.

26. They will not ordain any ecclesiastic unless he shows possession of property producing an annual revenue of at least 300 francs, and has attained the age of 25 years, and possesses the qualifications required by the canons received in France.

The bishops will not perform any ordination before the number of persons to be ordained has been submitted to the government and approved by it.

Section 4. The curés

27. The curés will enter upon their functions only after they have taken, in the hands of the prefect, the oath prescribed by the convention agreed to between the government and the Holy See. An official certificate of this oath will be drawn up by the secretary general of the prefecture, and a verified copy of it will be delivered to them.

28. They will be put in possession by the curé or the priest whom the bishop will designate.

29. They will be held to residence in their parish.

30. The curés shall be directly subject to the bishops in the exercise of their functions.

31. The curates and other officiating priests shall exercise their ministry under the surveillance and direction of the curés.

They will be approved by the bishop and subject to recall by him.

32. No foreigner may be employed in the functions of the ecclesiastical ministry without the permission of the government.

33. Every function is forbidden to any ecclesiastic, even French, who does not belong to any diocese.

34. A priest may not leave his diocese to serve in another without the permission of his bishop.

Section 5: Cathedral chapters and the government of the dioceses during the vacancy of the see

35. The archbishops and bishops wishing to make use of the faculty granted them to establish chapters may not do so without having reported the authorization of the government, both for the said establishment and also for the number and choice of the ecclesiastics destined to form them.

36. During the vacancy of the sees, for the government of

the dioceses provision will be made by the metropolitan or, in case of his failure or inability to do so, by the senior of the suffragan bishops. The vicars general of these dioceses will continue their functions, even after the bishop's death, until he is replaced.

37. The metropolitans, the cathedral chapters, will be held, without delay, to notify the government of the vacancy of the sees, and of the measures that will have been taken for the government of the vacant dioceses.

38. The vicars general who will govern during the vacancy, as also the metropolitans or capitularies, will not permit any innovation in the usages and customs of the dioceses.

Title III

Worship

39. There will be only one liturgy and one catechism for all the churches of France.

40. No curé may order public extraordinary prayers in his parish without the special permission of the bishop.

41. No feast day, except Sunday, may be established without the permission of the government.

42. In religious ceremonies the ecclesiastics will use dress and vestments suitable to their title: in no case and under no pretext may they assume the color and the distinctive marks reserved to the bishops.

43. All ecclesiastics will be attired in the French manner and in black. The bishops may add to this costume the pastoral cross and violet stockings.

44. Domestic chapels or private oratories may not be established without an express permission of the government, granted at the request of the bishop.

45. No religious ceremony will take place outside of edi-

fices consecrated to Catholic worship, in the cities, where there are temples destined for different religions.

46. The same temple may be consecrated for only one and the same religion.

47. In the cathedrals and parishes there will be a special place for Catholic individuals who hold civil and military offices.

48. The bishop will concert with the prefect the manner of calling the faithful to divine service by the ringing of the church bells. Without the permission of the local police these bells may not be rung for any other purpose.

49. When the government orders public prayers, the bishops will confer with the military commandant of the place regarding the day, the hour, and the manner of carrying out these orders.

50. Solemn preaching, called sermons, and preaching known under the name of stations of Advent and Lent, will not be given except by priests who have obtained a special authorization of the bishop.

51. The curés, at the sermon of the parish Masses, will pray and will have prayers said for the prosperity of the French Republic and for the consuls.

52. In their instructions they will not permit themselves any blame, either direct or indirect, against the persons or against the other religions authorized in the State.

53. At the sermon they will not make any publication foreign to the exercise of worship, unless such is ordered by the government.

54. They will not give the nuptial blessing except to those who certify, in good and due form, that they have contracted marriage before the civil official.

55. The registers kept by the ministers of religion, since they concern only the administration of the sacraments, cannot

in any case take the place of the registers ordered by the law for certifying the civil status of Frenchmen.

56. In all ecclesiastical and religious acts there is the obligation of making use of the equinox calendar established by the laws of the Republic; the days are to be designated by the names they have in the solstice calendar.

57. The day of rest for public officials will be fixed for Sunday.

Title IV

The circumscription of archbishoprics, bishoprics, and parishes; edifices destined for worship; the support of the ministers

Section 1. The circumscription of archbishoprics and bishoprics

58. There will be in France ten archbishoprics or metropolitans, and fifty bishoprics.

59. The circumscription of the metropolitans and of the dioceses will be made in conformity with the subjoined table.

Section 2. The circumscription of the parishes

60. There shall be at least one parish for every justice of the peace.

In addition there will be established as many subsidiary churches as need may require.

61. Each bishop, in concert with the prefect, will regulate the number and extent of these subsidiary churches. The plans drawn up will be submitted to the government and will not be carried out without its authorization.

62. No part of French territory can be erected into parishes or auxiliary churches without the express authorization of the government.

63. The priests serving the auxiliary churches will be named by the bishops.

Section 3. The support of the ministers

64. The salary of the archbishops will be 15,000 francs.

65. The salary of the bishops will be 10,000 francs.

66. The curés will be divided into two classes. The salary of the curés of the first class will be 1,500 francs; those of the second class will receive 1,000 francs.

67. The allowance payable to them for executing the laws of the Constituent Assembly will be deducted from their salary.

The general councils of the large communes may, from the income deriving from their rural possessions or from their tolls, grant the curés an increase of salary if the circumstances so require.

68. The curates and other functioning subordinate priests will be chosen from the number of ecclesiastics receiving income in execution of the laws of the Constituent Assembly. The sum total of these payments and the product of the offerings will form their salary.

69. The bishops will draw up projects of regulations relative to the offerings which the ministers of worship are authorized to receive for the administration of the sacraments. The projects of regulations, drawn up by the bishops, will not be published or otherwise put into effect until they have been approved by the government.

70. Every ecclesiastic receiving an allowance from the State will be refused his allowance if he refuses, without legitimate cause, the functions that may be confided to him.

71. The general councils of a department are authorized to procure a suitable lodging for the archbishops and bishops.

72. The rectories and adjoining gardens that have not been alienated will be placed at the use of the curés and the other priests serving the subsidiary churches. If such rectories are

lacking, the general councils of the communes are authorized to procure for them a residence and a garden.

73. Foundations which have for their object the support of the ministers and the exercise of worship may consist only of revenues constituted on the State; they will be received by the diocesan bishop and can be executed only with the authorization of the government.

74. Real property, apart from the buildings intended for residence and the adjoining gardens, cannot be assigned to ecclesiastical titles, nor can they be held by the ministers of worship by reason of their office.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume.

ANGLAS, Boissy d' : *Essai sur les fêtes.*
ANTONIN : *Histoire des émigrés français,* 1828.
ARNAULT : *Souvenirs d'un sexagénaire.*
ARTAUD de Montor : *The Lives and Times of the Popes.*
  Vie de Pie VII, 1839.
AULARD, A. : *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française,* 1924.
  Histoire politique de la Révolution française, 1901.
  Le culte de la raison.
  Paris sous le Concordat.
AURIBEAU : *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la persécution,* 1794.

BALDASSARI : *Relation sur l'enlèvement et la captivité de Pie VI.*
BALLANCHE : *Œuvres.*
BARBE-MARBOIS : *Journal d'un deporté non jugé.*
BARBERI (ed.) : *Bullarium romanum.*
BARRAS : *Mémoires.*
BARRUEL : *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* 1793.
  Mémoires sur le jacobinisme.
BASTON : *Mémoires,* 1899.
BAUNARD : *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* 1902.
BAZOT : *Code des franc-maçons.*
BEAUREGARD, Brumauld de : *Mémoires,* 1843.
BECCARIA, Cesare : *Tratto dei delitti e delle pene.*
BERTRAND : *Bibliothèque sulpicienne.*
BESNARD : *Souvenirs d'un nonagénaire.*
BLACHEZ : *Bonchamps et l'insurrection vendéene.*
BOERO : *Osservazioni sopra del pontificato di Clemente XIV,* 1853.
BOISGELIN : *Observations sur le décret de déportation.*
BOISSIN, Firmin : *Le Camp de Jalès.*
BOSSIER, G : *La religion romaine, la fin du paganisme.*

Bonald: *Theorie du pouvoir civil et religieux.*
Bossard: *Cathelineau, generalissime de la grande armée catholique et royale,* 1893.
Bossuet, Jacques: *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte.*
Bouille, Marquis de: *Souvenirs.*
Boullier, Isidore: *Mémoires ecclésiastiques,* 1846.
Bourlon: J.: *Les Assemblées du clergé et le Jansénisme,* 1909.
Boutard: *Lamennais.*
Bouvier, Claude: *Le Franc de Pompignan,* 1903.
Bridier: *Mémoires inédits de M. de Salamon, internonce à Paris,* 1892.
Broc, de: *Un évêque de l'ancien régime,* 1894.
Brugal, Simon: *Le schisme constitutionnel dans l'Ardèche,* 1889.
Brugere: *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise.*
Bryce, James: *The Holy Roman Empire.*
Buchez: *Traité de philosophie.*
Bullarium romanum (ed. Barberi).
Burke, Edmund: *Reflections on the French Revolution.*

Callipe, C.: *L'attitude sociale des catholiques français au XIX^e siècle.*
Campanella: *Civitas Solis,* 1643.
Cantu, Cesare: *Gli eretici in Italia.*
Storia dei cent' anni, 1750–1850.
Caron: *Les confesseurs de la foi.*
Cassagnac, Granier de: *Histoire des massacres de septembre.*
Cattet: *La verité sur le cardinal Fesch,* 1842.
Champion, Edme: *La France d'après les cahiers de 1789,* 1907.
Charpentier: *Jacques Cathelineau,* 1911.
Chateaubriand: *Essai sur les révolutions.*
Génie du christianisme.
Mémoires d'outre-tombe.
Œuvres.
Voyage en Amerique.
Chenire, André: *Œuvres en prose.*
Cherot: *Figures de martyrs,* 1907.
Chotard, H.: *Le pape Pie VII à Savone.*

Condorcet: *Tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain.*
Consalvi: *Mémoires.*
Contrasty: *Le clergé français exilé en Espagne (1792–1802)*, 1910.
Corpus juris confoederationis germanicae.
Correspondance de Napoléon, 1887.
Coste: *Une victime de la Révolution, Sœur Marguerite Rutan.*
Cretineau-Joly: *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus.*

Dallet: *Histoire de l'Eglise de Corée.*
Daudet, Ernest: *Les conspirations royalistes sous la Révolution.*
Debidour: *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat de 1789 à 1870.*
Delaporte: *Vie de H. Rauzan.*
Dementhon: *Vie de l'abbé J. B. Bottex,* 1903.
Deniau: *Histoire de la guerre de Vendée.*
Jacques Cathelineau.
Desdevises du Dezert: *L'Eglise et l'état en France,* 1907.
D'Haussonville: *L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire.*
Diderot: *La religeuse.*
Doumic, Max: *Le secret de la franc-maçonnerie,* 1905.
Drochon: *La Petite Eglise,* 1894.
Dubois: *Le Pancha-Tantra, fables de brahme Vichnou.*
Letter on the State of Christianity in China.
Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde.
Duchemin-Descepeaux: *Souvenirs de la chouannerie.*
Dufourqc, Albert: *Le régime jacobin en Italie,* 1900.
Dunoyer, A.: *Fouquier-Tinville,* 1913.
Dupuis: *L'origine de tous les cultes.*
Duruy, Albert: *L'instruction publique et la Révolution.*
Duvergier: *Collection des lois et décrets.*

Fabre, J.: *Les pères de la Révolution.*
Fabry, J. B.: *Génie de la Révolution considerée dans l'éducation.*
Itineraire de Buonaparte.
Faguet: *Le XVIII^e siècle.*
Questions politiques.
Vie de Rousseau, 1911.

Faillon: *Vie de M. Olier.*

Felice, G. de: *Histoire des protestants de France,* 1895.

Feller: *Biographie universelle.*

Ferrero: *L'Europa giovane.*

Fichte: *Beitrage zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums über die französische Revolution.*

Zurückforderung der Denkfreiheit von den Fürsten Europas.

Filangieri, Gaetano: *Scienza della legislazione.*

Flammermont: *Négociations secrètes de Louis XVI et du Baron de Breteuil,* 1885.

Fleury, J. P.: *Mémoires.*

Floquet: *Histoire du parlement de Normandie.*

Follenay, Paquelle de: M. *Teysseyrre.*

Fouillee, A.: *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens,* 1903.

Franchetti, A. M. de: *Pie VI dans les prisons du Dauphiné.*

Funck-Brentano: *Des lettres de cachet à Paris,* 1903.

Légendes et archives de la Bastille, 1904.

Gaduel: *Vie et esprit de M. Allemand.*

Gagarin: *La Compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie.*

Gagrine: *Vie du P. Marc Folloppe.*

Gaudry: *Traité de la législation des cultes,* 1854.

Gautherot, G. A.: *Conférences sur les origines de la Révolution.*

Gautier: *M^me de Staël et Napoléon.*

Portraits littéraires.

Gazier, A.: *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* 1887.

Gendry, Jules: *Pie VI, sa vie, son pontificat,* 1906.

Giobbio: *La chiesa e lo stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione,* 1905.

Giraid, Victor: *Pages choisies de Chateaubriand.*

Godard: *Les principes de 89 et la doctrine catholique,* 1865.

Goerres, Joseph: *Die Christliche Mystik.*

Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt.

Politische Schriften.

Rheinische Merkur.

Teutschen Volksbücher.

Teutschland und die Revolution.

GOSSELIN: *Relation de l'établissement du christianisme dans le royaume de Corée.*
GOYAU, G.: *L'Allemagne religieuse,* 1906.
Vue générale de l'histoire de la papauté, 1895.
GRAF, Arthur: *L'Anglomania in Italia,* 1911.
GRANDMAISON, Geoffroy de: *La Congrégation,* 1890.
Les cardinaux noirs, 1895.
GREGOIRE: *Essai historique sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane.*
Histoire des sectes religieuses.
Histoire du mariage des prêtres.
Mémoires, 1839.
GRENTE, J.: *Le culte catholique à Paris de la Terreur au Concordat,* 1903.
GRILLE: *Tableau comparatif des mandats et pouvoirs données en 1789 aux représentants de la nation,* 1825.
GROTIUS: *De jure pacis et belli.*
GUIBERT: *Vie de J. B. de La Salle.*
GUILLAUME, James: *Etudes révolutionnaires.*
GUILLON, M. J.: *Brefs et Instructions de Pie VI,* 1798.
Histoire du siège de Lyon.
GUIZOT: *Mémoires.*

HAUSSONVILLE: *L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire,* 1870.
HERDER, J. G.: *Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit.*
HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH: *Kirchengeschichte.*
Histoire des voyages des papes depuis Innocent Ier jusqu'à Pie VI, 1786.
HOBBES: *De cive.*
Leviathan.
HOFFDING, Herald: *History of Modern Philosophy,* 1900.
HOFFMANN, Amedeus: *Bruder Medardus.*
HOLBACH: *Système de la nature.*
HUC: *Le christianisme en Chine.*
HULOT: *Collectio brevium Pii VI.*

ISABEY and FONTAINE: *Cérémonies et fêtes du sacre,* 1805.
ISAMBERT: *Anciennes lois françaises.*

Jager: *Histoire de l'Eglise de France pendant la Révolution.*
Janet, Paul: *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale.*
Jauffret: *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Révolution,* 1803.
Joseph II und Leopold von Toscana, 1872.

Keller, Emile: *Le Syllabus et les principes de 89,* 1866.
Kraus: *Histoire de l'Eglise.*
Kurth, Godefroid: *The Church at the Turning Points of History,* 1929.

Laborie, Lanzac de: *Paris sous Napoléon,* 1908.
Lacombe, Bernard de: *Talleyrand, évêque d'Autun.*
Lacordaire: *Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. de La Mennais.*
La Gorce, De: *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* 1923.
Lagrange: *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup.*
Lamartine: *Histoire des Girondins.*
Lambert: *Vie de Mgr de Juigné,* 1821.
Lamennais: *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion.*
Reflexions sur l'état de l'Eglise en France.
Tradition de l'Eglise sur l'institution des évêques.
Lanson: *Histoire de la littérature française.*
Lanzac de Laborie: *Paris sous Napoléon,* 1908.
Larevelliere-Lepeaux: *Mémoires.*
Launay, A.: *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères.*
Les missionaires français en Corée.
Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e^ siècle.
Le Bon, Gustave: *La psychologie des foules,* 1895.
Leclercq: *Les martyrs.*
Lemaitre, Jules: *Chateaubriand,* 1912.
Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
Lemann: *Napoléon I^er^ et les Israelites.*
Lenotre, G.: *Les massacres de septembre,* 1907.
Les noyades de Nantes, 1911.
Vieiles maisons.

LE PLAY, F.: *Programme des Unions de la paix sociale*, 1877.
LESCOEUR: *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement Russe.*
Lettres inédites de Napoleon Ier.
LONGHAYE: *XIXe siècle*, 1900.
LIAUTARD: *Mémoires*, 1844.
LOCKE: *Epistola de tolerantia.*
On Civil Government.
LOUANDRE: *Introduction aux conteurs français de XVIIIe siècle.*
LOUVET: *Les missions catholiques au XIXe siècle.*
LUBERSAC: *Journal historique et religieux de l'émigration et de la déportation du clergé de France en Angleterre*, 1802.
LYONNET: *Le cardinal Fesch*, 1841.
Vie de Mgr d'Aviau.

MADAUNE: *Le Renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre.*
MADELIN, Louis: *La Révolution*, 1912.
La Rome de Napoléon, 1906.
MAISTRE, Joseph de: *Considerations sur la France.*
Soirées de Saint-Petersbourg.
MANSEAU: *Les prêtres et religieux deportés dans la Charente-Inférieure.*
Manuel pour la concordance des calendriers républicains et grégoriens, 1806.
MARCON, Marcel: *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution.*
MARNAS: *La religion de Jésus au Japon.*
MARSHALL, William: *Christian Missions.*
MARTENS: *Nouveau recueil de traités.*
MARTINIS, Raffaele: *Ius pontificium de Propagande Fide.*
MASSON, F.: *Le cardinal de Bernis.*
Les diplomates de la Révolution.
MATHIEU: *Le concordat de 1801.*
MATHIEZ: *La Révolution et l'Eglise*, 1910.
Les origines des cultes révolutionnaires, 1904.
Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante.
MAURRAS, Charles: *Trois idées politiques.*

Mauray: *Correspondance diplomatique,* 1895.
Maury: *Mémoires,* 1891.
  Œuvres choisies.
Mayol de Lupe: *La captivité de Pie VII.*
Mazon: *Un missionaire vivarais aux Indes,* 1899.
Meaux, Viscount de: *L'Eglise et la liberté aux Etats-Unis,* 1893.
Mellie, Ernest: *Les sections de Paris pendant la Révolution française,* 1898.
Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion à la fin du XVIII^{e} siècle.
Meester, Placid de: *Voyage de deux Bénédictins au monastère du Mont Athos.*
Meric: *Histoire de M. Emery.*
Metternich: *Mémoires.*
Meurthe, Boulay de la: *Documents sur la negociation du concordat.*
Michelet: *Histoire de la Révolution.*
  Précis d'histoire modèrne, 1835.
Mirabeau: *Travail sur l'éducation publique.*
Moillane, Durand de: *Histoire apologétique du Comité ecclésiastique.*
Mollier: *Saints et pieux personnages du Vivarais,* 1895.
Mommsen and Marquard: *Manuel des instructions romaines.*
More, Thomas: *Utopia.*
Moreau, G.: *Les prêtres émigrés aux Etats-Unis,* 1856.
Morris, Gouverneur: *Memorial and Correspondence.*
Mortimer-Ternaun: *Histoire de la Terreur.*
Mounier, J. J.: *De l'influence attribuée aux philosophes, aux francmaçons et aux illuminés sur la Révolution de France,* 1828.
Mourret: *La vénérable Marie Rivier,* 1898.
Musset, Alfred de: *Confession d'un enfant du siècle,* 1887.

Napoleon: *Correspondance,* 1887.
  Mémoires.
Necker: *De l'administration des finances de la France.*
Nervo, Baron de: *La conversion de Talleyrand,* 1910.
Nettement, A.: *Histoire de la littérature sous la Restauration.*

NEWMAN, John H.: *History of My Religious Opinions.*

Œuvres oratoires de M. de Boisgelin.
OLLE-LAPRUNE, Léon: *La vitalité chrétienne.*

PACCA: *Mémoires,* 1885.
Œuvres, 1845.
PAPON: *Histoire de la Révolution.*
PASQUIER: *Mémoires.*
PASSERI: *Mémoires sur la révolution d'Avignon et du Comtat Venaissin,* 1793.
PAULUS, Henry: *Commentar über das N. T.*
PELESZ, Julian: *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom.*
PERRON: *Vie du P. Condrin.*
PICOT: *Les Serbes de Hongrie.*
Mémoires, 1855.
PIERLING: *La Russie et le Saint-Siège.*
PIERRE, Victor: *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* 1887.
Seize Carmélites de Compiègne.
PIOLIN: *L'Eglise du Mans pendant la Révolution.*
PISANI: *La Dalmatie de 1797 à 1815.*
L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution.
L'épiscopat constitutionnel.
Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel, 1907.
PITOU, Ange: *Voyage à Cayenne.*
PORTES, Bittard des: *Charette et la guerre de la Vendée.*
POUJOULAT: *Histoire de la Révolution française.*
PRAT: *Essai historique sur la destruction des ordres religieux en France au XVIII^e siècle,* 1845.
PRESSENSE, E. de: *L'Eglise et la Révolution.*
PRUDHOMME: *Révolutions de Paris.*
PUAUX: *Histoire populaire des protestants français.*

QUINET: *Œuvres.*

RADET: *Mémoires.*
RAMBAUD, Alfred: *La France coloniale.*

RANKE: *Histoire de la papauté.*

RAOUL-ROCHETTE: *Histoire de la Révolution hélvetique de 1797 à 1803.*

REBOLD: *Histoire des trois grandes loges de France,* 1864.

REINACH, Theodore: *Histoire des Israelites,* 1885.

RENAN, E.: *L'avenir de la science.*

Révolutions de France et de Brabant.

RICARD, A.: *Le P. Combalat.*

RINIERI, I.: *La diplomazia pontificia nel secolo XIX,* 1902.

ROCQUAIN: *L'esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution.*

ROHRBACHER: *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise.*

ROSKOVANY, A. de: *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae,* 1870.

ROUSSEAU, Jean-Jacques: *Discourse on Inequality.*
Emile.
Social Contract.

ROUSTAIN: *Les philosophes et la société française au XVIII^e^ siècle.*

SABTIE, A. C.: *Les massacres de septembre: les martyrs du clergè,* 1912.

SAINTE-BEUVE: *Causeries du lundi.*
Galerie de portraits historiques, 1883.
Portraits des femmes.

SAINT-LEON, Martin: *Histoire des corporations,* 1895.

SAINT-PIERRE, Bernardin de: *Œuvres.*

SCHLEGEL, Frederick von: *Philosophy of History.*

SCHLITTER: *Die Reise des Papstes.*

SCHOELL, F.: *Recueil de pièces officielles.*

SCIOUT, Ludovic: *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé.*

SEGUR and SAUVE: *Un admirable martyr sous la Terreur,* 1904.

Sentiments de Napoléon sur le christianisme.

SERBAT, L.: *Les assemblées du clergé de France,* 1906.

SEVESTRE, E.: *La déportation du clergé orthodoxe pendant la Révolution.*

SICARD: *A la recherche d'une religion civile,* 1895.
L'ancien clergé de France avant la Révolution, 1917.

Simon, Eugène: *La cité chinoise.*
Sorel, A.: *Carmélites de Compiègne,* 1878.
  Le couvent des Carmes, 1864.
  L'Europe et la Révolution française, 1915.
Spuller: *La Mennais.*
Stolberg, Leopold von: *Büchlein von der Liebe.*
  Geschichte der Religion Jesus Christi.
Strauss, David: *Essai d'histoire religieuse.*

Taine: *French Revolution.*
  L'ancien régime.
  Le régime moderne.
  Les origines de la France contemporaine.
Talleyrand: *Mémoires,* 1892.
Teil, De: *Naples et le Directoire.*
Theiner, A.: *Die neusten Zustande ker katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katherne bis auf unsere Tage.*
  Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France, 1790–1800, 1857.
  Histoire des deux concordats.
  L'histoire de Clement XIV.
Thiers: *Histoire du consultat et de l'empire.*
Thomassin: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline.*
Thureau-Dangin: *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre.*
  Royalistes et républicains.
Tieck: *Franz Sternbold.*
Tocqueville, A. de: *L'ancien régime et la Révolution,* 1860.
Tornezy: *La legende des philosophes.*

Uzureau: *Noel Pinto,* 1912.

Vaissiere: *Lettres d'aristocrates,* 1907.
Vandal, Albert: *L'avènement de Bonaparte,* 1903.
Vanderpol: *La guerre devant le christianisme,* 1912.
Van Duerm (ed.): *Correspondance de Consalvi avec Metternich,* 1899.

VEUILLOT: *Guerres de la Vendée et de la Bretagne.*
VIALAY, A.: *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution. Les cahiers de doleances du tiers état en 1789,* 1910.
VIGNY, Alfred de: *Servitude et grandeur militaire.*
VINET: *Essai sur la manifestation des convictions religieuses.*
VITTORIA: *De jure belli.*
VOLTAIRE: *Discourses on Man.*
Epîtres à Uranie.
Philosophical Letters.

WALLON, Henri: *La Terreur,* 1881.
WELSCHINGER, H.: *Le pape et l'empereur,* 1905.
Le roi de Rome, 1897.
WISEMAN: *Recollections of the Last Four Popes.*

ZALENSKI, Stanislas: *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche* (French tr., 1886).

Index

Abbaye of St. Germain: Father Sicard's account of the massacres at, 185; Imprisonments at, 182; Massacres at, 185, 189
Absolutism of Hobbes, 25
Absolutism, royal, 90: Abuse of, 12
Actors, Civil rights of, 329
Advocates of the clergy, 117 note
Alençon, Murder of Father Valframbert at, 191 note
Alexander I (czar), 552: friendly to Catholic Church, 554; The Holy Alliance, 462; Leo XII and, 554
Alfieri (poet), 23: *La tirannide* by, 29
Alquier: envoy to Pius VII, 415; on scene of canonization, 420
American Revolution, French aid to, 10
Anarchy: in Paris, 90; in the provinces, 78
Ancient Regime, Decline of, 8 ff.
Ancona, seized by Napoleon, 296
Angela Merici, canonized by Pius VII, 419
Angers, Defeat of Vendeans at, 249
Annates: Abolition of, 80; memorial from Rome, 82
Anona, the, 48 note
Antibes, Murder of Father Cartier at, 191 note
Antraigues, Count: and *émigré* priests, 200
Antraigues, Madame, 200
Aranda (count) and *émigré* priests, 200
Archetti (nuncio), 50
Army, the: under the Directory, 290
Arouet de Voltaire. *See* Voltaire
Artaud de Montor, secretary of Cacault, 372
Articles of 1682, 19
Artois, Count of: Emigration of, 79
Assembly, Constituent. *See* Constituent
Assembly of the Clergy (1775): Association of writers approved by, 44; Jansenism and, 42
Assignats, 164
Atheists in the Institute, 288
Auctorem fidei (bull), 20, 59
August 4, Night of, 79
  Action of the clergy, 79
  The curés, 80
  De Juigné, 79 f.
  De Juigné's praise of, 83
Aulard on feast of Reason, 232 note
Austria: conquered by Napoleon, 424; French *émigrés* in, 208
Austrian Succession, War of the, 9
Autonomous naturalism, 26
Aviau, François d': *émigré* at Rome, 212
Avignon
  Affair of, 147 ff.
  Camus and, 148
  The civil oath ordered in, 152
  Economic crisis, 148
  Pius VI and reforms in, 149 f.
  The Pope's duty, 151 note
  Possession of Holy See, 148
  Revolutionary propaganda in, 148
  Status of, 147
  And union with France, 150
  Uprisings in, 148
Avoine (bishop), 163
Azara, 292 f.: and armistice of Bologna, 293; Qualities of, 292

Bailly proclaimed mayor of Paris, 78
Ballanche: view of the Revolution, 3
Baltimore, Province of, 477
Barruel, Father: editor of *Journal ecclésiastique*, 65; on *émigré* priests in England, 203
Basel, Diocese of, 474
Bassville (French agent), Murder of, 218 ff.
Bastille, the, 76: The prisoners in, 77; Taking of, 76
Batavian Republic, Persecution in, 327
Bavaria: Concordat with, 472; Edict of Religion, 473

Bayane (cardinal) ordered back to Rome, 421
Beauharnais, Josephine. *See* Josephine
Beauregard, Brumauld de: on priests in Guiana, 303
Beauty, deified by Goethe, 27
Beccaria, Cesare: on capital and labor, 27; *Tratto dei delitti e delle pene* by, 32
Belgium
  Arrest of priests, 313
  Combats in, 314
  Committee of Public Safety in, 312
  Deportation of juring priests, 315
  Louvain University suppressed, 313
  Non-juring priests, 313
  Persecution in, 312 ff.
Bellarmine on civil power, 89
Belloy, de (cardinal), devoted to Napoleon, 418
Benedict the Moor canonized by Pius VII, 419
Benefice, Simple, 115 note
Benière, Father: Execution of, 234
Bérardier, Father: saved by Robespierre, 192 note
Bernier: and Concordat of 1801, 366; influence in the Vendée, 366; leader of Vendeans, 248; Spina and, 366 ff.
Bernis (cardinal): kept in ignorance, 128; Luxury of, 171; oath to the Constitution, 172; pensioned by King of Spain, 172
Berthier (general): Goods of Holy See seized by, 317; march on Rome, 298
Bertier of Rodez, 165
Besnard, Father: *Souvenirs d'un nonagénaire* by, 361
Bible Society (London), 511
Binardière, Duportail de la: Murder of, 178
Bishoprics, nomination of nobles to, 21
Bishops, French
  Abjuration of several, 230
  Canonical institution of, 436
  Election of, 122
  Emigré, 166, 389
  Income of, 21
  Institution of, 83
  Juring, 159
  Number of married, 232
  Pope's right to remove, 380
  Resignation of, 468
Bishops (*continued*)
  Two defections, 156
Bishops, Constitutional, 265
  Character of, 162
  One for each department, 163, 165
  Rehabilitation of, 387
  Validity of consecration of, 140 note
"Black cardinals," the, 435: at Fontainebleau, 448
Blanca, Florida: opposition to France, 199
Bogomiles in Bulgaria, 539
Boisgelin (bishop)
  Character of, 68
  Concordat of 1801, 382
  His offer to the king, 154
  At London, 204
  On need of reforms, 22
  On night of August 4, 80
  On ownership of Church property, 103
  On rights of the clergy, 117
  On sale of Church property, 100
  At States General, 68
Boislève (officialis): Nullity of Napoleon's marriage declared by, 433
Bollène, Execution of nuns of, 255
Bologna: Armistice of, 293; ceded to France, 297
Bonal (bishop): Form of oath proposed by, 154; National council asked by, 119
Bonald, Louis de, 488: *Législation primitive* by, 488; *Théorie du pouvoir* by, 489 note
Bonaparte, Jerome: Annulment of marriage of, 414; Marriage of, 412
Bonaparte, Joseph: and concordat of 1801, 376; at Rome, 297
Bonaparte, Napoleon. *See* Napoleon
Bonchamp, Marquis de: Vendean leader, 242
Bonnet (bishop), 163
Boscodon, Trappist abbey at, 308 note
Bossuet on arbitrary government, 12
Bottex, Father: Murder of, 189 note
Bourbon, Cardinal de: visitator in Spain, 396
Bracciano Museum, medals pilfered, 318
Braschi family, 46
Bravard, Father: Murder of, 177
Breda (Holland), Napoleon at, 439
Breton Club, 331
Briefs (papal)

Briefs (*continued*)
  Charitas, 156
  Dominus ac Redemptor, 550
  Intimo ingemescimus corde, 135
  Non sine magno, 477
  Pastoralis sollicitudo, 274
  Quod aliquantum, 156
  Quod de fidelium, 476
Brittany and the Vendée, 236 ff.
Brongniart, Father: constitutional curé, 233
Brotier, Father: deported to Guiana, 302
Bruder Medardus by Hoffmann, 503
Bruguière (bishop) in Korea, 515
Brussels, Anti-Republican manifestations in, 313
Buchez, view of the Revolution, 3
Büchlein von der Liebe by Stolberg, 501
Bulgaria: Bogomiles in, 539; Latin Catholics in, 539
Bulgaris, Eugenius: *Theologicon* by, 529
Bulls (papal)
  Auctorem fidei, 20, 59
  De salute animarum, 475
  In universalis ecclesiae, 556
  Indefessum personarum, 538
  Inter praecipua, 474
  Paternae caritatis, 472
  Quam memorandam, 385
  Qui Christi Domini vices, 390
  Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum, 479, 511
  Ubi primum, 471
Burke, Edmund: and French Revolution, 202
Busca (cardinal), papal envoy, 296

Cacault, François de
  Artaud, secretary of, 372
  And concordat of 1801, 370
  To Florence, 373
  French envoy, 296
  Suggestion to Consalvi, 373
Caesarean Gallicanism, 16
Cahiers, the, 84: of the bishops, 85; of the clergy, 84
Calendar, Republican, 226, 284
Calvinist Churches regulated by Napoleon, 399
Cambacérès (jurist) and Napoleon's divorce, 431
Campanella: *Civitas Solis* by, 27; Utopias of, 23
Camus
  And Avignon, 148
  In Constituent Assembly, 89
  Gallicanism of, 143
  On institution of bishops, 83
  On jurisdiction of clergy, 120
  On state control of religion, 117
  At States General, 69
Candor, Lodge of, 331
Canonizations by Pius VII, 419
Canons, chapters of: Suppression of, 141
Cantons of Switzerland, 337
Capital and labor, Beccaria on, 27
Caprara (cardinal)
  And *émigrés* in Austria, 208
  Organic articles read to, 381
  Papal envoy, 381, 394
  Recalled by Pius VII, 422
Carbonari, the, 460: condemned, 480
Cardinals: Abdication of some, 318; arrested in Rome, 318; Removal of thirteen from Paris, 435
Carmelite nuns, Execution of sixteen, 255
Carmelite monastery: Massacres at, 187; Prisoners in, 180 f.; Some escapes from, 189
Carnot, Lazare, 197
Carpentras, Raphael consul at, 149
Carrier, Jean: Description of, 256; drownings at Nantes, 256
Carroll, John: appointed by Pius VI, 212; Pius VI and, 50
Cartier, Father: Murder of, 191 note
Caselli, Father: and concordat of 1801, 364
Casoni (cardinal), Secretary of State, 416
Castellane (bishop), Murder of, 191
Castle Sant' Angelo occupied by French troops, 421
Castlereagh: conferences with Consalvi, 466; Consalvi welcomed by, 465
Catechism, ordered by Napoleon, 419
Catechisms, "Enlightened," 40
Cathelineau, Jacques, 243 ff.: Vendean hero, 240
Catherine II of Russia, 547
  And the Jesuits, 49
  On National Assembly, 126
  Pius VI and, 49
  Siestrzencewicz named bishop by, 56
Catholic cantons of Switzerland, 338

Catholic emancipation in Ireland, 342
Catholicism in France in 1799, 332
Catholics, Irish: Political rights of, 341
Cattereau, Jean: Vendean patriot, 238
Cayenne, Deportations to, 301
Cerfbeer (banker), 330
Cervoni (general), Pius VI and, 299
Chabot (priest), Marriage of, 233
Champagny, Count de: Talleyrand replaced by, 420
Champenois (bishop) in India, 516
Champion de Cicé, Disloyalty of, 134
Chapters of canons, Suppression of, 141
Charette, François: Vendean leader, 244
Charitas (brief), 156
Charles IV, Pius VI's concordat with, 396
Chateaubriand, Viscount, 482 ff.
  Essai sur les révolutions by, 482
  Genie du christianisme by, 482: on missions, 510
  At London, 204
  Mémoires d'outre-tombe by, 486
  In Rome, 405
  In the United States, 213
Chaudet, Father: Murder of, 178
Chemillé, Vendean battle at, 243
Chemin-Duponte, *Manuel des theanthropophiles* by, 280
Cheverus (bishop), 214
Chiaramonti (Pius VII), 346: Benedictine life of, 348; bishop of Imola, 348
China, 518 ff.
Chinese synod, The first, 519
Chollet (deputy) on oath of hatred, 308
Chonan, Jean: Vendean patriot, 238
Chouans, the: in the Vendean War, 247
Christian Brothers, religious garb resumed by, 418
Christliche Mystik by Goerres, 503
Church in France
  And the Empire, 410 ff.
  Persecution of (1790–99), 137 ff.
  Possessions of, 94
  Supplanted by civil religion, 271 ff.
  Wealth of, 94
Church and state: in France, 18, 20, 112 ff.; Robespierre on, 118
Church property: at disposal of the nation, 102; its sale proposed by Talleyrand, 99; Sale of, 99 ff.; Successive legislation on, 103
Churches, Sacking of, 225
Cicé, Champion de (bishop): Disloyalty of, 134; Pastoral of, 177 note
Cisalpine Republic: Anti-Roman spirit of, 392; concordat project, 395; organic laws, 394; representatives assembled at Lyons, 393
Civic religion, 272
Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 116 ff., 121 ff.
  Approved by Louis XVI, 134
  Clergy's duty of residence, 122
  Condemned by Pius VI, 147, 157
  Consequences of, 137
  Elections of bishops and curés, 122
  Favored by Jansenists, 134
  Gallicanism of, 121
  Oath not taken by some, 154
  Oath taken to, 153 f.
  Opponents to, 164
  Opposition to canon law, 133
  Pius VI and, 132 ff.
  Prudhomme on, 142
  Sanctioned by Louis XVI, 144
  Taine on, 335
Civil government, Locke on, 25
Civil religion, 272; Church supplanted by, 271 ff.
Civita Castellana, Victory of French at, 321
Civitas Solis by Campanella, 27
Clairac, Murder of Father Lartigues at, 177
Clement XIV, brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*, 550
Clementine Museum, Pius VI and, 47
Clergy of France, 14-16, 43
  Cahiers of, 84
  Conduct of the *émigré*, 198
  The constitutional, 158, 228
  Emigration of, 198
  General agent of, 97 note
  The lower: at States General, 15, 69
  Non-juring: Deportation of, 175; encouraged by Pius VI, 174; in the provinces, 172
  Oath to the Constitution by, 138 ff., 143, 153, 155
  Obligation of residence, 122
  "Officials of morality," 139
  Reckless generosity of, 79
  Revenue of, 82 note
  Support by the state, 116

Clergy of France (*continued*)
  Two orders of, 15
  The upper, 15: and the state, 16; and States General, 67
Clergy of Germany: opposition to Rome, 17; Power of, 17
Cletus, Blessed: Martyrdom of, 518, 521
Clubs, the, 91: Jacobin, 331
College of Propaganda: Debts of, 510; founded by Gregory XV, 510; reconstituted, 510
Collette, canonized by Pius VII, 419
Colybes, the, 523
Committee of Public Safety, 222: in Belgium, 312
Commune of Paris, 179
  Committee of execution appointed by, 182
  Committee of execution circular by, 190
  Danton and, 180 note
  Execution of 62 members of, 257
  Fifty clergy imprisoned by, 180
  Insolence of, 183
  Marat and, 180 note
  Origin of, 180 note
Communism of the *Civitas Solis*, 27
Comtat Venaissin: economic crisis, 148; Pius VI yields, 297; Status of, 147
Conclave: Pius VI's constitution on, 320; at Venice, 328
Concordat with
  Bavaria, 472
  Cisalpine Republic, 395
  Holland, 474
  Naples, 473
  Piedmont, 474
  Russia, 473
  Spain, 396
  Switzerland, 474
Concordat of 1516, Project to re-establish, 470
Concordat of 1801, 350 ff.
  Bernier, 366
  Boisgelin preacher, 382
  Cacault, 370
  Commission of cardinals, 369
  Consalvi, 365
  Eighth project, 376
  Fifth proposal, 368
  First proposals, 368
  Father Caselli, 364
  Grégoire, 362
Concordat of 1801 (*continued*)
  Joseph Bonaparte, 376
  Napoleon's ultimatum, 372
  Opponents in France, 391
  Opposition of *émigré* royalists, 390
  Papal envoys to Paris, 363 ff.
  Pius VII, 370
  Popular joy over, 382
  Provisions of, 378
  Ratification of, 380
  Ratified by Napoleon, 378
  Seventh project, 375
  Significance of, 392 ff.
  Spina, 363-65
  Talleyrand, 361, 369: absent from Paris, 375
  Text of, 562
Concordat of 1813: pronounced null by Pius VII, 448; Provisions of, 448; signed by Pius VII and Napoleon, 448
Concordat of 1816: a dead letter, 470; not ratified by Pius VII, 470
Condorcet on Masonry, 333
Confraternities suppressed, 175
Congress of Ems (1786), 17
Congress of Vienna, 461: Consalvi at, 461
Consalvi (cardinal)
  Cacault's suggestion to, 373
  The commercial code, 479
  Concordat of 1801, 365
  Conferences with Castlereagh, 466
  At Congress of Vienna, 461
  Dismissal of, 416
  The fine arts fostered by, 479
  At London, 465
  Named Secretary of State, 351
  Napoleon and, 374 ff.
  Napoleon on, 479
  Negotiations with Naples, 473
  Negotiations with Russia, 473
  To Paris, 373
  Reception by Napoleon, 374
  Reforms in Papal States, 478
  At Venice conclave, 344
  Welcomed by Castlereagh, 465
Considérations sur la France by De Maistre, 486
Constant, Benjamin, 329, 334
Constituent Assembly
  Abolition of tithes, 82
  Aims of, 140 ff.

Constituent Assembly (*continued*)
  Antireligious work of, 73
  Bishop de Bonal, 119
  Beginning of anarchy, 74
  Camus at, 83, 120
  Change of States General into, 73
  Church and state, 112 ff.
  On Church property, 99 ff.
  Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 116 ff., 121, 137
  Constitution committee, 98
  Corporations suppressed, 93
  Disregard of the pope, 141
  Ecclesiastical committee of, 96, 108
  Gallicanism of, 112
  Mirabeau at, 81, 89
  Parliaments dissolved, 93
  Religious orders, 106 ff.
  Religious vows suspended, 107
  Removal to Paris, 102
  Report on conditions in the Vendée, 239
  Sale of Church property, 99 ff.
  States General changed into, 73
  Support of the clergy, 116
  Suppression of religious orders, 109 ff.
  Suppression of religious vows, 110
  Talleyrand at, 97 ff.
Constitution of the year III, 270
Constitutional bishops, 162, 265
  Character of, 162
  Number of, 163 note
  One for each department, 163, 165
  Rehabilitation of, 387
  Valid consecration of, 140 note
Constitutional Church, 265 ff.
  Councils of, 386
  Grégoire leader of, 268
  Its claims to be the National Church, 275
  National council of, 276: letter to Pius VI, 279
Constitutional clergy, 158, 228
Constitutional curés, Success of, 165
Constitutional priests, Abjuration of, 262, 386
Constitutionals, Grégoire leader of, 386
Consuls, Charges against the, 318
Continental blockade against England, 422
Convention, the (France), 196 ff.
  Decree: against ecclesiastics, 222; against harboring refractory priests, 224; against refractory priests, 222; of Vendean extermination, 246
  Despotism of, 231
  End of, 270
  The Girondists, 197
  Laws on marriage of priests, 232
  The Mountain, 197
  The Plain, 197
  Saints' feasts abolished, 326
  Worthy measures of, 197 note
Coppoli (archbishop), Academy of the Catholic Religion founded by, 480
Corea. *See* Korea
Coronation: Feast of the, 418; of Napoleon, 406
Corporations, Suppression of, 93
Costa (cardinal) and French *émigrés* in Italy, 210
Couches, Murder of priests at, 191 note
Council of Pistoia. *See* Pistoia
Council of "United Bishops" founded by Grégoire, 267
Crisis, The intellectual, 23 ff.
Curés
  Country, 14
  Election of, 122
  On night of August 4, 80
  A portion congrue, 14
  Success of constitutional, 165
Cussac, Father de: imprisoned, 181
Czerniewicz, Jesuit vicar general, 57

Dalmatia, Latin Catholics and Orthodox in, 534
Dannenmayr, 39
Danton
  Appeal to violence by, 183
  Character of, 179
  And the Commune, 180 note
  Father Lhomond saved by, 192 note
  Jacobins personified by, 167
  And limits of France, 221
  Minister of Justice, 179
  And September massacres, 190 note
Daughters of Charity: executed at Cambrai, 253 note; re-established by Napoleon, 406
De jure belli by Vittoria, 29
De jure pacis et belli by Grotius, 30
De salute animarum (bull), 475

Decadaire feasts, 316
Decadaire worship, 284
Declaration of Independence (American), 9
Declaration of the Rights of Man, 73, 87 ff.: Christian understanding of, 5; Text of, 559
Deport, Right of, 80
Deportation: decreed by the Assembly, 182; of non-juring clergy, 175, 192; of priests, 301
Der Katholik (periodical) by Goerres, 503
Dereser, Father (apostate), 233 note
Desmoulins, Influence of, 76
Diderot, *La religieuse* by, 288
Directory, the, 270 ff.
  Arbitrariness of, 310
  The army under, 290
  Attacks on Catholic religion, 289
  Deeds of, 310 ff.
  Napoleon and, 290
  Number of priests persecuted by, 312
  Oath of hatred toward royalty, 308
  Persecution under, 300 ff.
  Power of minister of police, 310
  Prosecution of the *émigrés,* 311
  Recoil of, 295
  The Terror under, 290
  Tyranny of, 310
Discourse on Inequality by Rousseau, 36
Discourses on Man by Voltaire, 34
Divorce, Napoleon's, 430 ff.
Divorce decree, 168
Divorce law abolished, 468
Dominus ac Redemptor (brief), 550: confirmed by Pius VI, 57
Donnadieu, Father: Execution of, 311
Doria (cardinal), expelled from Rome, 422 f.
Dubois, Father: in India, 516; *Mœurs . . . de l'Inde* by, 517
Dubois (bishop of New York), 214
Dubourg (bishop of New Orleans), 214: at Lyons, 513
Dufresse, Blessed: Martyrdom of, 518
Duke of Orleans, resignation as grand master, 331
Du Lau (bishop), Murder of, 188
Du pape by De Maistre, 487
Duphot, Murder of, 297
Duportail, Father: Murder of, 178
Dupuis, *L'origine de tous les cultes* by, 288
Dupuy, Father: Murder of, 177
Durand de Maillane, 96

Eastern Church, 523 ff.
Eastern Europe, Churches of, 533 ff.
Ecclesiastical Committee of Constituent Assembly, 96: on Church property, 113; Packed membership of, 109
"Ecclesiastical Council": on canonical institution of bishops, 436; established by Napoleon, 432; on nullity of Napoleon's excommunication, 437; Questions submitted to, 435
"Edict of Religion," Bavarian, 473
Emery, Father: Napoleon resisted by, 441; and oath of hatred, 309; on oath of liberty and equality, 193; Priests sent to America by, 213
Emigration: of Count of Artois, 79; of the nobility, 79
Emigré bishops, 166: Resistance of, 389
Emigré priests. *See* Priests
Emigrés: in Germany, 205 ff.; Prosecution of, 311; at Rome, 131
Emile by Rousseau, 36
Empire of France (1804–14) and the Church, 410 ff.
Ems: Congress of (1786), 17; Punctuation of, 16
Encyclopedia, the: The unity of, 33
Encyclopedists: Influence of, 15; Influence at court, 44; Madame de Pompadour friend of, 44
"Enemies of the people," Decree against, 224
England
  Catholics in, 506
  Condition of Catholics in, 201
  Emigré priests in, 201
  Influence of *émigré* priests in, 204
  Lessening of anti-Catholic prejudices, 466
  Philosophical movement in, 24
  Prestige of, 460
Epitres à Uranie by Voltaire, 34
Ernest (Duke of Gotha), 41
Essai sur l'indifférence by Lamennais, 493
Essai sur les révolutions by Chateaubriand, 482

Europe, Restoration of, 459
Europe, Eastern: Churches of, 533 ff.
Expilly (bishop), 114: elected bishop of Finistère, 139
Exposition des principes, 157

Fabre d'Eglantine and republican calendar, 226
Feast of the Federation, 123
Ferdinand IV (king of Naples): offer to take Pius VII to Sicily, 423; order to French in Rome, 321; and tribute to Holy See, 51
Fesch (cardinal)
  Ambassador to Rome, 404
  At head of "Ecclesiastical Council," 432
  Marriage of Napoleon and Josephine, 406, 408 note
  Napoleon's envoy, 412
  And religious congregations, 418
Ferrara: ceded to France, 297; Napoleon at, 295
Ferrara (cardinal), imprisoned by Napoleon, 292
Fichte, Jacobinism defended by, 205
Filangieri, Gaetano: *Scienza della legislazione* by, 28
Fischer, Christopher, 39
Flaget (bishop of Bardstown), 214
Florence, Pius VI at, 319
Florida Blanca: opposition to France, 199
"Flying squadron," the: at conclave (1799), 346
Folleville, impostor among Vendeans, 248
Fontana (bishop) in China, 521
Fontainebleau, Pius VII at, 445
Fontenelle, 32
Foreign Mission Seminary, re-established by Napoleon, 406, 468
Foreign Mission Society, 508: dissolved by Napoleon (1809), 511; re-established, 417, 508, 511; Work of, 512
Foreign missions, 508 ff.
  Effects of the Restoration, 508
  Favored by Napoleon, 509
  Jesuits, 511
  Korea, 514 ff.
  Report of Portalis, 509
  Restoration of Jesuits, 508
Foreign views of the Revolution, 125
Forêt, René: Vendean patriot, 240
Fouché, 364: Council of constitutionals dissolved by, 387
Fouquier-Tinville (prosecutor), 193 note, 222
France
  Bishops from the nobility, 21
  Break of diplomatic relations with Holy See, 215
  Calvinist Churches regulated, 399
  Church and state in, 20
  Clergy in, 43
  Conditions in 1789, 64
  Diocesan boundaries, 472
  Economic classes in, 11
  Emigrés' return to, 342
  Foreign invasion of (1813), 449
  In 1799, 327 ff.
  Jews in, 401
  Lutheran Churches in, 399
  Masonic lodges in, 43
  Minister of worship in, 20
  Number of Catholics (1801), 386
  Population (1801), 386
  Protestantism in, 398 ff.
  Resignation of the bishops, 468
  Return of refugees to, 329
  Royal government in, 13
  Serfdom in, 10
  Upper clergy in, 67
  Wealth of Church in, 94
Francis I (emperor) at Rome, 480
Francis II (emperor): Abdication of, 417; and conclave (1799), 344; The exclusive by, 345
Francis Caracciolo, canonized by Pius VII, 420
Frankenberg (cardinal), deported from Belgium, 313
Franz Sternbold by Tieck, 499
Frederick William III, 475: at Rome, 480
Freedom of worship decreed (1795), 260
Freemasonry: Chief officers of French, 455; in France, 43
Freemasons
  During the French Revolution, 331
  And Illuminati, 41
  In Italy, 210
  Napoleon and, 401, 454
  Oath to the Constitution, 196 note
French philosophers, 32
French Revolution. *See* Revolution

French Republic recognized by Pius VI, 273, 297
Fribourg, Jesuits received in, 474
Friedland, Battle of, 416

Gacé, Murder of priests at, 191 note
Gallais, Father: imprisoned, 181
Gallicanism: Caesarean, 16; Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 121; of Constituent Assembly, 112; in Russia, 56
Garampi (nuncio), 56
Gassendi, 32
General agent of the clergy, 97 note
Generals, Political influence of, 272
Genie du christianisme by Chateaubriand, 482, 510
Genoa, Pius VII at, 461
George III (of England): and *émigré* priests, 203; return of art works to Rome, 465
Georgetown College, 213
German romanticism, 497
Germany
  Anti-Roman ideas in, 397
  Attitudes to French Revolution, 205
  Churches of, 17
  Emigré priests in, 205
  French *émigrés* in, 205 ff.
  Hospitality to *émigré* clergy, 208
  Illuminism in, 27
  Philosophical movement in, 25
  Power of upper clergy in, 17
  Prince electors: Rome's monetary demands, 17 note, 21
  Serfdom in, 10
Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi by Stolberg, 501
Ghislain (C.M.) in China, 518
"Gilded Youth," the, 197
Girondists, the, 197
Glatier, Father: Execution of, 311
Gobel (bishop)
  Abdication of, 229
  Career of, 159
  Election of, 159
  Oath taken by, 159
  And Paris clergy, 229
  Resignation of, 229
Goddess of Reason, Worship of, 230
Godoy (Spanish minister), 395; and *émigrés* in Spain, 200
Goerres, Joseph, 498, 502
  Der Katholik (periodical), 503
  Die christliche Mystik by, 503
  Die Teutschen Volksbücher by, 502
  Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt by, 502
  Rheinische Merkur founded by, 502
  Teutschland und die Revolution by, 502
Goethe, Beauty deified by, 27
"Golden youth," 263
Goulard, Father: on reform project, 118
Graf, Arthur: *L'Anglomania in Italia* by, 29 note
Grand, Mrs.: marriage to Talleyrand, 361
Grand Lodge, Grand Orient merged with, 401
Grand Orient: Grand Lodge merged with, 401; without grand master, 332; Reorganization of, 455
Greek Church of Constantinople, Non-Catholic, 523
Greek revolution, 526
Grégoire (bishop)
  And abolition of annates, 80
  Career of, 161 note
  Character of, 152, 161
  And concordat of 1801, 362
  And the constitutional Church, 279
  Council of United Bishops founded by, 267
  Death of, 389
  Leader of constitutional Church, 268
  Leader of constitutional priests, 315
  Leader of the constitutionals, 386
  And the "National Council," 276
  Against new paganism, 228
  Opposition to feast of Supreme Being, 264
  Pisani on, 266
  Refusal of apostasy, 230
  On religious domain, 230
  "Report of the United Bishops," 277
  Resignation of, 388
  Soul of constitutional Church, 161
Gregory I (pope) on human liberty, 89 note
Gregory XV (pope), College of Propaganda founded by, 510
Gregory V (patriarch), Death of, 526
Grievances, Memorials of, 84

Grotius: *De jure pacis et belli* by, 30; and law of nations, 23, 29

Guégan, Father: on religious proposals, 119

Guiana
  Conditions in, 303
  Constitutional priests in, 316
  Deportations to, 301
  Exiles in, 302 ff.
  Priests deported to, 300

Guillotine: Installation of, 182; made permanent, 197

Guinguené: on system of morality, 333

Gustavus III of Sweden, Pius VI and, 50

Guyot de Folleville, impostor among Vendeans, 248

Hardenberg (chancellor) at Rome, 475

Hauy, Valentin: and theophilanthropy, 281

Hedderich, Philip (O.F.M.), 39

Helvetic Republic, Persecution in, 327

Herder, J. G.: *Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* by, 27

Hertz, Henrietta, 330

Hertzberg on the French Revolution, 206

Herzan (cardinal) at conclave (1799), 345

Hobbes: Absolutism of, 25; on origin of society, 25

Hoche (general), 258

Hoffmann, Amadeus: *Bruder Medardus* by, 503

Holland: Catholics of, 474; Concordat with, 474; Philosophical movement in, 29

Holy Alliance, the, 462

Holy Ghost, Congregation of the: reestablished, 417

Holy Roman Empire, End of, 417

Holy See: Ambassadors to, 480; Break of diplomatic relations with France, 215; memorial on the annates, 82

Holyday, The weekly, 284 ff.

Hontheim, Nikolaus von, 17

Hugon, Jean (i.e., Bassville), Murder of, 215 ff.

Huguenots. *See* Protestants

Hyacinth Marescotti canonized, 419

Hymns to the Virgin by Novalis, 499

Ile d'Oléron: Deportations to, 301; Exiled priests at, 308; Priests imprisoned at, 300

Ile de Ré
  Conditions at, 306
  Constitutional priests at, 316
  Deportations to, 301
  Description of, 305
  Life of deported priests at, 306
  Priests imprisoned at, 300, 306

Illuminati, the, 40: German, 206; in Italy, 210; and Masons, 41

Illuminism in Germany, 27

In universalis ecclesiae (bull), 556

Indefessum personarum (bull), 538

India, 516 ff.: Father Dubois in, 516; Jacobins in, 328; Missions in, 328

"Infernal columns," the, 258

Institute, the, 271: atheists in, 288

Intellectual crisis, the, 23 ff.

Inter praecipua (bull), 474

Intimo ingemiscimus corde (brief), 135

Ireland: Act of Union, 342; Catholic emancipation, 342; penal laws, 341; political rights of Catholics, 341

Ireland, Parliament of: suppressed, 342

Irish, Society of the United, 341

Irreligion (1789–99) in France, 287

Issy, Arrests at, 180

Italian spirit, 209

Italy: *Emigré* priests in, 209 ff.; Philosophical movement in, 27; Revolutionary ideas in, 209

Jacobi and French Revolution, 205

Jacobin clubs, 331

Jacobinism, defended by Fichte, 205

Jacobins, 167: in India, 328; Influence of, 179

Jalès, Federations of, 235 note

Jansenism
  Assembly of the Clergy and, 42
  Bishop Ricci and, 57
  Defended by Duke of Tuscany, 57
  Influence of, 41
  Among the Maurists, 42
  Among the Oratorians, 42
  At Synod of Pistoia, 18 f.

Jansenists: Constitution of the Clergy favored by, 134 ff.; Influence of, 15

Japan, Preservation of the faith in, 515

Jarente (bishop), 21: Oath taken by, 159

Jerico, Pauline: and foreign missions, 513
Jerome Bonaparte, Annulment of marriage of, 414
Jesuits
  Abolished in France, 42
  Catherine II and, 49
  In China, 518
  Expulsion of, 9: from Russia (1815), 554
  In foreign missions, 511
  Included in suppressions, 110
  Louis XV and, 42
  Peter the Great and, 55
  Received in Fribourg, 474
  Re-establishment of, 480, 508, 511
  Return to France, 468
  In Russia, 550 ff.: Pius VI and, 49, 56 f.
  Russia refuge for, 56
  Among September victims, 194 note
  Suppression of, 328, 508
  Vicar general in Russia, 57
Jerome Bonaparte, Marriage of, 412
Jews, the
  In France, 401
  In the French Revolution, 329
  Napoleon and, 452
  Pius VI's popularity among, 49
  Rise to power in France, 334
Joseph II of Austria, 16: Pius VI and, 47; Regulation of the Church by, 52
Joseph Bonaparte, king of Naples, 416
Josephine Beauharnais, Napoleon's marriage to, 406, 408 note, 430
Josephism, 16
Journal des curés, 418
Journal ecclésiastique, 65
Juigné (bishop)
  On abolition of tithes, 82
  Character of, 67
  Charity of, 67
  On night of August 4, 79
  And oath of hatred, 309
  On sacrifices of the clergy, 83
  At States General, 63
Juring bishops, 159: Retractations of, 170

Kant: news of taking of the Bastille, 77 note; Rousseau's influence on, 26
Karalevsky, Cyril, 523 note
Kaunitz on French Revolution, 206
King of Rome, title of imperial prince, 437
Klopstock and French Revolution, 205
Kommentar über das N. T. by Paulus, 504
Korea: Bishop Brugière in, 515; Father Tsiou in, 515; First Catholics in, 515; Missions in, 514 ff.
Krüdner, Baroness von, 462; and Holy Alliance, 463

La Bruyère on courtier's joy, 13
La Fare (bishop), at States General, 63, 68
La Font de Savine (bishop), 21
La Force (prison): Imprisonments at, 182; Murders at, 189
La Gorce, Pierre de: on Masonic lodges, 43
La Jaunais, Vendean treaty at, 258 f.
La religieuse by Diderot, 288
La Rochefaucauld (bishop), imprisoned, 180
La Terreur sous le Directoire by Pierre, 300
La tirannide by Alfieri, 29
Lafayette: commander of National Guard, 78; influential Mason, 91
Lake poets, the, 506
Lamennais, Félicité de: *Essai sur l'indifférence* by, 493
Lamennais, Jean-Marie, 495
Landry, Maille de la Tour: at Ile de Ré, 307
L'Anglomania in Italia by Graf, 29 note
Langoiran, Father: Murder of, 177
Lanjuinais, 96: on execution of Constitution of the Clergy, 141
Larevellière-Lépaux, president of executive Directory, 301
Lartigues, Father de: Murder of, 177
Latin rite Catholics in eastern Europe, 539
Laval: Persecution at, 173; Vendean capture of, 247
Law, Spinoza on, 30
Law of nations, Grotius on, 29
Lawyers at States General, 69
Lazarists. *See* Vincentians
Le Coz (bishop): Charge against, 317; and the constitutionals, 386; president of the "council," 276

Le Franc de Pompignan, Charges against, 135 note
Le Lau (bishop) imprisoned, 180
Le Perche, Murder of Father Duportail at, 178
Leben Jesu by Strauss, 505
Législation primitive by Bonald, 488
Legislative Assembly, 167 ff.
  Confraternities suppressed, 175
  Decree of deportation, 182
  Deportation: of clergy, 175; of non-juring priests, 192; of non-jurors, 179
  Divorce decree, 168
  Freedom to colonial Negroes, 168
  Oath of Liberty and Equality, 192 ff.
  Split in, 331
  Succeeded by the Convention, 196
Lenkeiwicz, Jesuit vicar general, 57
Leo XII: Alexander I (czar) and, 554; bull *Inter praecipua,* 474; and Korean mission, 515
Leopold (duke of Tuscany), 18: becomes emperor, 20
Les Vans, Murder of priests at, 177
Lessing; *Nathan der Weise* by, 26; and *Wolfenbüttel Fragments,* 26
Lettres de cachet, 76 note
Lhomond, Father: saved by Danton, 192 note
Liberty, Gregory the Great on, 89 note
Liberty and Equality, Oath of, 192 ff.
Licentious writings, Spread of, 15 note
"Little Church," the, 360, 390
"Little Terror," the, 289
Liturgy, Convention decrees on, 226
Locke: on civil government, 25; on origin of society, 25; Philosophy of, 25
Loiseau, Father: Murder of, 191 note
Loménie de Brienne (bishop), Oath taken by, 159
London: Consalvi at, 465; *Emigré* priests at, 204
Longwy, Taking of, 182
Loreto seized by Napoleon, 296
L'origine de tous les cultes by Dupuis, 288
Louis XIV: Glories of, 12; Royal power of, 12
Louis XV, and Jesuits in France, 42
Louis XVI
  Character of, 66
Louis XVI (*continued*)
  Constitution of Clergy sanctioned by, 134, 144
  Execution of, 219 ff.
  And foreign powers, 145
  Misty policy of, 138
  And Necker, 66
  New title of, 93 note
  Oath to Constitution approved by, 136
  Order to States General, 73
  Pius VI and, 144 ff.
  Pius VI's confidence in, 128
  Pius VI's esteem for, 220
  Procession at Versailles, 63
  In refuge at Legislative Assembly, 178
  Religious loyalty of, 130
  States General opened by, 63
Louis XVIII, 359 ff.
  Charter granted by, 468
  On future pope, 356
  Letter to Paul I, 359
  Society of Foreign Missions re-established by, 511
Louvain University suppressed, 313
Lower clergy of France, 15: at States General, 69
Loyseau on limits of royal power, 12
Lucern, Battle of (1798), 339
Luçon, Devotion of the people at, 173
Lutheran Churches in France, 399
Lutzen, Battle of, 449
Lyons, Cisalpine Republic's representatives at, 393

Mack (general), received in Rome, 321
Mackintosh and French Revolution, 202
Madaune, Father: on *émigré* priests in England, 204
Mai (cardinal): Vatican librarian, 479
Maillane, Durande de, 96: commentary on articles of Pithou, 113
Maillard, Stanislaus
  At the Abbaye, 189
  Career of, 184
  Character of, 184
  And committee of execution, 182
  At massacres: at Carmelite monastery, 187; at the Abbaye, 187
Maille, de (bishop): At Ile de Ré, 307
Maistre, Joseph de, 486
  Considérations sur la France by, 486
  Du pape by, 487
  On the Revolution, 6

Maistre, Joseph de (*continued*)
  Soirées de Saint-Petersbourg by, 487
  View of the Revolution, 4
Monosque, Murder of priests at, 178
Marat: and the Commune, 180 note; The Terror organized by, 197
Marechal (archbishop of Baltimore), 214: nomination of bishops, 477
Marengo, Napoleon's victory at, 352
Maria Louisa, marriage to Napoleon, 434
Maria Theresa: and Josephism, 16; and Pius VI, 47
Marie Antoinette, Unpopularity of, 66
Marist Fathers, Foundation of, 512
Maronites, 532
Marriage of priests, 232
Married bishops, Number of, 232
Married priests, Number of, 232
Marseilles, Murder of priests at, 178
Martineau: Ecclesiastical legislation by, 115; Jansenism of, 97
Martiniana (cardinal): and concordat of 1801, 363; Napoleon and, 354
Martinists (sect), 330
Masonic societies (1789), 91
Masonry. *See* Freemasonry
Masons. *See* Freemasons
Massacres, the September. *See* September
Massena (general): Freemason, 401; and the pillage of Rome, 318
Massimi (marquis), Arrest of, 298
Mattei (cardinal): at conclave (1799), 345; and Napoleon, 295; papal envoy, 296
Maury: *émigré* in Italy, 211; made archbishop of Paris by Napoleon, 440; on oath of liberty and equality, 194; on sale of Church property, 100; suspended, 211
Maximilian (elector) and French *émigrés*, 208
Mazenod (bishop), Oblates of Mary Immaculate founded by, 512
Meaux, Murder of priests at, 191
Méhée, Father: Account of massacres, 186
Melchite Catholic Church of Antioch, 530 ff.
Mémoires d'outre-tombe by Chateaubriand, 486
Memorials of grievances, 84
Mennecy, Closing of church at, 228
Metaphysics of Spinoza, 30
Metternich: defender of Holy Alliance, 464; negotiations with Napoleon, 438
Michael de l'Hospital, 32
Milan, Napoleon at, 411
Minister of police, Power of, 310
Minister of worship, in France, 20
Miollis (general): in Rome, 422; Seizure of Rome by, 421
Mirabeau
  Character of, 72
  At Constituent Assembly, 81
  Influence of, 72
  In National Assembly, 89
  On ownership of Church property, 102
  Physical appearance of, 72
  At States General, 72
Miracles, Denial of Christ's, 26
Miratte, Father: Murder of, 178
Missions, Foreign. *See* Foreign
Mœurs . . . de l'Inde by Dubois, 517
Moïse (bishop), Resignation of, 388
Moldavia, 540
Monarchy, Spinoza on, 31
Monasteries, Suppression of, 109 ff.
Montaigne, 32
Montaleau (Mason), 332
Montenegro, 536
Montesquieu on division of powers, 84
Montmorin, Count de: Bernis kept in ignorance by, 128; Murder of, 189; Policy of, 139
Monserrat abbey, and *émigré* priests, 201
Morality, Proposed system of, 333
More, Thomas: *Utopia* by, 24
Morris, Gouverneur: on French Revolution, 126
Mount Athos, Monastery of, 524
Murat (general), Mason, 401
Murat (king of Naples), 424: Arrest of Pius VII ordered by, 426
Musquiz and concordat of 1801, 365
Mysore, Nabob of, 328
Mythengeschichte der Asiastischen Welt by Goerres, 502

Naples: Concordat with, 473; seized by French, 321
Naples, King of: tribute payable to Holy See, 51

Napoleon
  Abdication of: first, 449; second, 401
  Absence of cardinals at marriage of, 434
  Address to clergy of Milan, 353
  Affectionate meeting with Pius VII, 446
  Ambition of, 342, 414
  Ancona seized by, 296
  Anger of, 292, 360, 377
  Austria conquered by, 424
  Benefactions to Church, 417
  Benevolence to Protestants of Holland, 439
  At Breda (in Holland), 439
  Cardinal Martiniana and, 354
  Character of, 377
  Choice of second wife, 430
  Christian death of, 458
  Concordat of 1801, 350 ff.: negotiations with Pius VII, 359 f.; ratified by, 378
  Concordat of 1813 signed by, 448
  Conflict with Pius VII, 415
  Consalvi and, 374 ff.
  Continental blockade by, 422
  Coronation of, 406
  Coup d'état (1799) by, 342
  Crossing of the Alps by, 352
  Daughters of Charity re-established by, 406
  Demands upon the Pope, 293
  Desire for agreement with the Pope, 352
  Divorce of, 430 ff.: devised by Cambacérès, 431; the diocesan court, 433; Pius VII's protest, 435
  "Ecclesiastical Council" established by, 432
  Entry into Vienna, 424
  Excommunicated, 425
  Exiled to St. Helena, 564
  Foreign Mission Seminary re-established by, 406
  Foreign Mission Society dissolved by (1809), 511
  Foreign missions favored by, 509
  And the Freemasons, 401, 454
  At Ferrata, 295
  His family welcomed by Pius VII, 457
  His wish to be crowned by the Pope, 403
Napoleon (*continued*)
  And the Jews, 452
  As king of Italy, 411
  Lazarists re-established by, 406
  Loreto seized by, 296
  March against Rome, 291
  Marriage to Josephine, 406, 408 note
  Marriage to Maria Louisa, 434
  Maury made archbishop of Paris by, 440
  At Milan, 292, 411
  On need of peace, 352
  Pius VII and, 349
  Pius VII's intervention for the exiled, 458
  A priest requested by, 458
  Printing of a catechism ordered by, 419
  Proclaimed emperor, 402
  Project to keep Pope in France, 410
  And the Protestants, 450
  Reception of Consalvi, 374
  Request for papal recognition of new Constitution, 273
  Resisted by Father Emery, 441
  Retreat from Russia, 445
  Rise of, 290
  Roman distrust of, 355
  Second abdication of, 461
  At Tolentino, 296
  Victory at Marengo, 352
  Victory at Pravdinsk, 416
  Volney kicked by, 360
Napoleon Bonaparte, first use of the double name, 394
Nathan der Weise by Lessing, 26
National Convention, Convoking of, 179
"National Council" (1797), 276
National Council (1811), 442
  Decisions accepted by Pius VII, 444
  Ordered dissolved by Napoleon, 443
  Reopened, 444
  Three bishops imprisoned, 443
"National Council" of Constitutional Church: decrees of, 278; letter to Pius VI, 279
National Guard, Lafayette commander of, 78
National religion, a, 280 ff.
Nations, Battle of the, 449
Natural religion, 272
Naturalism, 32: Autonomous, 26
Neapolitan Republic, Persecution in, 327

Necker: Dismissal of, 74; Influence of, 329; Louis XVI and, 66
Negroes, Emancipation of colonial, 168
Netherlands. *See* Holland
Neufchateau, François: on national feasts, 284
Nikolaus von Hontheim, 17
Niebuhr, Berthold (Russian minister), 475
Nine Sisters, Lodge of the, 331
Ninon de Lenclos: salon of, 33; Voltaire and, 33
Nobility, Emigration of the, 79, 198
Nobles nominated to bishoprics, 21
Non sine magno (brief), 477
Non-juring clergy
  Decree of deportation of, 192
  Deportation of, 175
  Encouraged by Pius VI, 174
  Heroism of, 234
  Life of, 166
  In the provinces, 172
Notre Dame cathedral, Profanation of, 231
Nouvelles ecclésiastiques, Jansenist journal, 15
Novalis, *Hymns to the Virgin* by, 499

Oath of allegiance, English, 466
Oath of hatred toward royalty and anarchy, 308: and De Juigné, 309; explained by Chollet, 308; Father Emery on, 319 note
Oath of Liberty and Equality, 192 ff.
  Divergent views about, 193
  Father Emery on, 193
  Maury on, 194
  Pius VI on, 195
Oath to the Constitution: approved by Louis XVI, 136; by the clergy, 123, 138 ff.; taken by clergy, 155
Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Foundation of, 512
Ochs (Swiss leader), 337
O'Connell, Daniel, 342
Orange, Execution of 32 nuns at, 253
"Orangemen," 341
Oratorians, Jansenism among, 42
Organic articles, the, 373
  Portalis and, 381
  Provisions of, 384
  Revocation of, 470
  Talleyrand on, 384
Orleans, Duke of, 179: resignation as grand master, 331; Third Estate joined by, 73
Our Lady Help of Christians, Feast of, 457
Overbeck, 498 f.

Pacca (cardinal)
  On *émigré* bishops in Germany, 207
  On *émigré* nobles in Germany, 207
  On *émigré* priests in Germany, 207
  Expelled from Rome, 423
  Nuncio at Cologne, 18
  On Pius VII's character, 348
  On Pius VII's return to Rome, 457
  Secretary of State, 423
Paganism, Schiller and, 27
Paine, Thomas: and French Revolution, 202
Papal bulls. *See* Bulls
Papal elections, Bull on, 425
Papal primacy, Synod of Pistoia and, 19
Papal States, the, 478
  Annexed to French Empire, 424
  French *émigrés* in, 210
  Under Pius VII, 351
  Reforms of Consalvi, 478
Paris: Anarchy in, 90; Bailly acclaimed mayor of, 78; Murder of Father Chaudet at, 178; "Spontaneous anarchy" in, 74
Paris Commune. *See* Commune
Paris sections, 180 note: and Jews, 330
Pâris (deacon), Veneration of, 42
Paris, Brother (C.M.), in China, 518
Parishes, Temporal administration of, 261
Parliaments, French: dissolved, 93; and Jansenism, 42
Pastoralis sollicitudo (brief), 274
Patterson, Miss: Jerome Bonaparte's marriage to, 412
Patronage of benefices, 115
Paternae caritatis (bull), 472
Paul I (czar), 551: envoy sent to Pius VII, 351; letter from Louis XVIII, 359
Paulo, Count de: royalist leader, 336
Paulus, Heinrich: *Kommentar über das N. T.*, 504
Peasants, oppression of, 11
Pensions to ex-religious, 110
Périer of Clermont, 164

Persecution of the Church (1790–99), 137 ff.
  Under the Directory, 300 ff.
  At Laval, 173
  Fresh outburst of, 215
  New laws of, 174 ff.
Peter the Great and Jesuits, 55
Petit, Madame: and foreign missions, 513
Pfeffer (Swiss leader), 337
Philosophers: French, 32; Rousseau's debt to English, 23
"Philosophers," the: and French Revolution, 332
Philosophical Letters by Voltaire, 34
Philosophical movement: in England, 24; in Germany, 25; in Holland, 29; in Italy, 27
Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit by Herder, 27
Philosophism, Danger of, 50
Philosophy: influence on the Revolution, 23; Sentimental, 15
Philosophy, social: in England, 24
Philosophy of History by Schlegel, 501
Pidalion, the, 527
Piedmont, Concordat with, 474
Pieracchi (papal envoy), 294
Pierre, Victor: *La Terreur sous le Directoire* by, 300
Piki, Korean convert, 515
Pillage of St. Lazare, 74
Pinot, Father: Execution of, 251
Pio-Clementine Museum founded by Pius VI, 47
Pistoia, Synod of, 18
  Condemned by Pius VI, 20, 59
  Jansenism at, 18 f., 57
  And papal supremacy, 19
  Sacred Heart devotion condemned, 19
Pithou, Pierre: Articles of, 113
Pitt, William: Act of Union under, 342; and coalition against France, 221; and French Revolution, 202
Pius VI, 46 ff.
  Allocution on spoliation of the Church, 124
  And the annates, 130
  Attack of paralysis, 322
  Avignon reforms, 149 f.
  And Bishop Carroll, 50
  Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor,* confirmed by, 57
Pius VI (*continued*)
  Briefs: *Charitas,* 156; *Intimo ingemiscimus corde,* 135; *Quod aliquantum,* 156; *Pastoralis sollicitudo,* 274
  Bulls: *Auctorem fidei,* 20, 59; *Indefessum personarum,* 538
  Catherine II and, 49
  Character of, 46
  Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 132 ff.: condemned, 127, 147, 157
  Clergy encouraged by, 174
  Confidence in Louis XVI, 128
  Constitution on conclave, 320
  Council of Pistoia condemned by, 59
  Death of, 324
  Delay by, 131, 138
  Deposition of, 388
  Difficulties with Russia, 55
  Doctrine of German bishops condemned by, 18
  Draining of Pontine Marshes, 47
  Early career of, 46
  Esteem for Louis XVI, 220
  Exile of, 300
  Favors to the Jews, 49
  Finances of, 47
  First encyclical of, 50
  First years of pontificate of, 46 ff.
  At Florence, 319
  In France, 321 ff.
  And French *émigrés* in Italy, 211
  French Republic recognized by, 297
  Gustavus III and, 50
  Illness of, 297, 299, 321
  On interpretation of an oath, 319
  And the Jesuits, 49, 56
  And Jesuits in Russia, 57
  John Carroll made bishop by, 212
  Joseph II and, 47
  Kept uninformed, 129
  Louis XVI and, 144 ff.
  Maria Theresa and, 47
  And murder of Bassville, 219
  Pio-Clementine Museum founded by, 47
  Popularity of, 48
  Recognition of French Republic by, 273
  Rumanian Church and, 538
  At Siena, 319
  Synod of Pistoia condemned by, 20
  Temporizing policy of, 127 ff.
  At Turin, 321

Pius VI (*continued*)
  At Valence, 323
  Visit to Vienna by, 52
Pius VII
  Academy of the Catholic Religion, 480
  Accident to, 480
  Affectionate greeting by Napoleon, 446
  Angela Merici canonized by, 419
  Appeal of Korean Catholics, 515
  Arrival at Savona, 427
  Benedict the Moor canonized by, 419
  Briefs: *Non sine magno*, 477; *Quod de fidelium*, 476
  Bull on papal elections, 425
  Canonizations by, 419
  Carbonari condemned by, 480
  Character of, 355
  Collette canonized by, 419
  And concordat of 1801, 350 ff., 370
  Concordat of 1813 signed by, 448
  Concordat negotiations with Napoleon, 359 f.
  Concordat with Spain, 396
  Death of, 480
  Decisions of the National Council accepted by, 444
  Departure from Rome, 427
  Departure from Savona, 445
  Discouragement of, 447
  Economies of, 351
  Election of, 346
  Excommunication of invaders of Papal States, 425
  Family of Napoleon welcomed at Rome, 547
  At Fontainebleau, 445
  Francis Caracciolo canonized by, 420
  On freedom of the Church, 350
  At Genoa, 461
  His isolation at Savona, 428
  His lodging at Savona, 429
  Hyacinth Marescotti canonized by, 419
  Imprisonment of, 428
  Intervention for exiled Napoleon, 458
  Jesuits reconstituted, 480
  Journey to Paris, 405
  Last years of, 457 ff.
  Liberation of, 449
  Life of, 347
  And marriage of Jerome Bonaparte, 412
Pius VII (*continued*)
  Mother of, 347
  Napoleon and, 349
  Napoleon excommunicated by, 425
  Napoleon's conflict with, 415
  Nullification of concordat (1813) by, 448
  Province of Baltimore erected by, 477
  Qualities of, 348
  Re-establishment of Jesuits, 511
  And religious orders, 479
  At Savona, 449
  Seizure of, 427
  Suppression of French bishoprics, 390
  Triumphal return to Rome, 449, 457
  Welcome to Napoleon's mother, 457
Pius VII, bulls of
  De salute animarum, 475
  In universalis ecclesiae, 556
  Paternae caritatis, 472
  Quam memorandam, 385
  Qui Christi Domini vices, 390
  Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum, 479, 511
  Ubi primum, 471
Plain, the, 197
Plato, *Republic* by, 24
Plouguerneau, Difficulty of installing curé at, 237
Poets, The English, 506
Poland
  Divorce in, 543
  Form of government, 543 note
  Partitions of, 542
  Seculars and Basilians in, 544
  Third partition of, 551
Political and social crisis, 9 ff.
Political economy, 28
Political reform, Desire for, 4
Pompadour, Madame de: friend of Encyclopedists, 44
Pompignan, Le Franc de: Charges against, 135 note; at States General, 68
Pondichery, Seminary at, 516
Pont-Ecrepin, Murder of Father de Saint-Martin at, 178
Ponthion, Father: Murder of, 178
Pontine Marshes, Draining of, 47
Pope, right to remove bishops, 380
Popes: Pius VI (1775–99), 46 ff.; Pius VII (1800–23), 347 ff.

Portalis: and the organic articles, 381; report on Catholic missions, 509
Power of sovereign, Limits of, 12
Praemunire, Statute of, 465
Pravdinsk, Battle of, 416
"Presbytery" of Paris, 267
Presentation, Congregation of the, 308 note
Priests
  Abjuration of constitutional, 386
  Deaths on prison ships, 223
  Deportation of, 223, 301
  Deported to Guiana, 300, 302 ff.
  Drowning of fifty, 256
  Heroism of non-juring, 234
  Imprisoned at Ile de Ré, 306
  The interned, 305 ff.
  Marriage of, 232
  Murder of, 176
  Murder of emigrating, 191
  Number of married, 232
  Persecution of the juring, 315
  Saved by English man-of-war, 302
Priests, *Emigré*, 297 ff.
  In England, 201: Financial help for, 203; Influence of, 204
  In Germany, 205
  At Montserrat, 201
  In Spain, 199
Prince electors, Rome's monetary demands, 17 note
Promise of submission to Republic, 268
Propaganda, College of: Debts of, 510; founded by Gregory XV, 510; reconstituted, 510
Propaganda seminary reorganized, 480
Propagation of the Faith Society, 509: Founding of, 513
Protestant cantons of Switzerland, 337
Protestantism in France, 398 ff.
Protestants in France: during French Revolution, 328; Property restored to, 329; Napoleon and the, 450
Provinces, Anarchy in the, 78
Provincial assemblies (1789), 65
Prudhomme: on Constitution of the Clergy, 142; on Paris anarchy, 90
Prussia: Catholics in, 475; nomination of bishops, 476
Punctuation of Ems, 16

Quam memorandam (bull), 385
Qui Christi Domini vices (bull), 390
Quieta non movere, motto of Metternich, 438
Quirinal: invaded by French troops, 423, 426; Pillage of, 318
Quod aliquantum (brief), 156
Quod de fidelium (brief), 476

Rabelais, Skepticism of, 32
Radet (general): Pius VII arrested by, 426; Quirinal invaded by, 426
Raphael of Avignon, 149: consul at Carpentras, 149
Rationalism of Socinus, 32
Rautenstrauch (O.S.B.), 39
Raux (C.M.) in China, 518
Raynau, Father: Murder of, 177
Reason, Worship of, 231
Rectories for school purposes, 265
Reding, Aloys (Swiss general), 338
Reflections on the French Revolution by Burke, 202
Reform, Desire for, 4
Reform, Social: Filangieri's aim, 28
Refugees, French: Return of, 329
Reimarus, Samuel, 26
Reims, Murder of priests at, 191
Religion, State control of, 117
Religion, Civic, 272
Religious dress, Wearing of, 174
Religious houses combined, 111
Religious orders in France
  Membership of, 107
  Pensions to former members, 110
  Pius VII and, 479
  Regulation by the old regime, 106
  Suppression of, 109 ff.
Religious papers combined, 418
Religious vows, Suppression of, 110
Renaissance catholique en Angleterre by Thureau-Dangin, 505
Renan, E.: on idea of English science, 25 note
Republic by Plato, 24
Republic, French: recognized by Pius VI, 273
Republic, Roman: Proclamation of, 299
Republican calendar, 226, 284
Restoration, the French: reanimation of foreign missions, 508
Restoration of Europe, 459
Retractants, Conditions imposed on, 262
Revelation, Denial of possibility of, 26
Revenue of clergy, 82 note

Revolt, Right to: Rousseau on, 36
Revolution, American: French aid, 10
Revolution, French
  De Maistre on, 6
  Desire for reform, 4
  Foreign views of the, 125
  Influence of philosophy, 23
  Movement of social renovation, 4
  Object of a new religion, 5
  Three movements of, 4
  Views of, 3
  Worship of, 5
Revolutionary ideas in Italy, 209
Revolutionary tribunals, 221, 224
Rheinische Merkur (weekly), founded by Goerres, 502
Ricci, Lorenzo (Jesuit general): Death of, 19, 49
Ricci, Matteo: *True Idea of God* by, 518
Ricci, Scipio (bishop)
  Jansenism of, 19, 57
  Popular outbreak against, 57
  See resigned by, 59
  At Synod of Pistoia, 19
Richard, Gabriel: French *émigré* in United States, 214
Rights of Man, Declaration of the, 73, 87 ff.
Rights of Man by Paine, 202
Rivier, Marie: foundress, 308 note; Zeal of, 235
Robespierre: Execution of, 257; Father Bérardier saved by, 192 note; Rise and fall of, 197; on Church and state, 118
Roettiers de Montaleau (Mason), 332
Rohan, Duke de: "affair of the necklace," 21
Roland and non-juring clergy, 176
Romagna added to France, 297
Roman Republic: Persecution in, 327; proclaimed, 299
Romanticism, German, 497
Rome
  Anti-Catholic ceremony in, 320
  Berthier's march on, 298
  At death of Pius VI, 328
  Former sovereigns in, 457
  French *émigrés* in, 131, 356
  German clergy's opposition to, 17
  Sacking of (1798), 317 ff.
  Seized by French troops (1808), 421
  Seminaries reopened, 480
  Taking of, 298 ff.
Romme (mathematician) and calendar, 227 note
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 35
  Character of, 35
  Debt to English philosophers, 23
  Discourse on Inequality by, 36
  Emile by, 36
  Influence of, 35, 71
  Kant influenced by, 26
  On origin of our evils, 23
  On primitive state of man, 36
  On right to revolt, 36
  Social Contract by, 36
Royal power, Limit of, 12
Rumanian Church, 538
Russia
  Catholic Church in, 547 ff.
  Concordat with, 473
  Economic changes in, 460
  Gallicanism in, 56
  Jesuits in, 550 ff.
  Jesuits expelled from, 554
  Napoleon's retreat from, 445
  Pius VI's difficulties with, 55
  Refuge for Jesuits, 56
Rutan, Sister Marguerite: Execution of, 252
Ruthenian Catholic Church, 541 ff.

Sacraments, Abstention from, 42
Sacred Heart devotion and Synod of Pistoia, 19
Saint-Etienne, president of the Assembly, 329
St. Firmin, Seminary of: Murders at, 189
St. Gall, Diocese of, 474
St. George (monastery, Venice), 328
St. Helena, Napoleon exiled to, 461
St. Lazare, Pillage of, 74
Sacramentines, Execution of, 28, 254
St. Louis (church, Versailles), 63
Saint-Martin, Father de: Murder of, 178
St. Maur, Benedictines of: Jansenism among, 42
St. Napoleon, Feast of, 418
Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de: on system of morality, 333
Sainte-Croix, Baron de: and Avignon, 150
Salins, Father de: Murder of, 188
Salons, French, 33

Santo Domingo: The civil war in, 168; Priests in United States from, 214
Sapienza, the: New chairs at, 479; Oath taken by professors of, 319
Savine (bishop): Conversion of, 159 note; Death of, 308 note; imprisoned, 180
Savona: Arrival of Pius VII at, 427; Pius VII's departure from, 445; Pius VII's isolation at, 428; Pius VII's lodging at, 429
Schassenburg (general), 338
Schiller and paganism, 27
Schlegel, Frederick von: *Philosophy of History* by, 501
Schneider, Father (apostate), 233 note
Scienza della legislazione by Filangieri, 28
Scott, Walter: Influence of, 505
Secret societies, 460
Sections, Paris: and Jews, 330
Seminaries (Roman) reopened, 480
Sentimental philosophy, 15
September massacres, 184 ff.: Danton and, 190 note; Father Sicard's account, 185; Process of canonization of victims of, 190 note
Serbia, 536
Serfdom: in France, 10; in Germany, 10
Sicard, Father: account of September massacres, 185
Siena, Pius VI at, 319
Siestrzencewicz, Stanislas, 545
  Bishop of Mallo, 548
  Bishop of Moghilev, 549
  Career of, 548 note
  Evil influence of, 552
  Jesuits and, 550
  Named bishop by Catherine II, 56
Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph (priest)
  Abjuration of, 230 note
  And abolition of tithes, 81
  Influence of, 71
  Pamphlets by, 70
  Seminary studies by, 70
  "Social art" by, 71
  At States General, 73
Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, 512 note
Skepticism of Rabelais, 32
Social Contract by Rousseau, 36: influence on Kant, 26
Social philosophy in England, 24
Social reform, Filangieri's aim, 28
Social renovation, Movement of, 4
"Societies of worship" and administration of parishes, 261
Society, Locke and Hobbes on origin of, 25
Society of Jesus. *See* Jesuits
Society of Foreign Missions. *See* Foreign
Society of the United Irish, 341
Socinus, Faustus: Rationalism of, 32
Solari, Benedict (bishop), 20
Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum (bull), 479, 511
Spain: *Emigré* priests in, 199; Godoy, minister, 395; resistance to Napoleon, 424
Spina: Bernier and, 366 ff.; and concordat of 1801, 359, 363 ff.
Spinoza: on law, 30; Metaphysics of, 30; on monarchy, 31
Spitz, Andrew (O.S.B.), 39
"Spontaneous anarchy" of Paris (1789), 74
Staël, Madame de, 334: advice about Protestantism, 398
State, Upper clergy and the, 16
State and Church in France, 18, 20
State control of religion, 117
States General
  Attendance at, 63
  Boisgelin (bishop) at, 68
  Camus at, 69
  Change into Constituent Assembly, 83
  First sessions, 65
  La Fare (bishop) at, 68
  Lawyers at, 69
  Lower clergy at, 69
  Louis XVI's order to, 73
  Mirabeau at, 72
  Opened by Louis XVI, 63
  Pompignan (bishop) at, 68
  Prayers for the, 63 note
  Session of, 65
  Sieyès at, 73
  Transformation into Constituent Assembly, 73
  Treilhard at, 69
  Two groups in, 69
  Upper clergy at, 67
Statute of Praemunire, 465
Stolberg, Count von, 501: *Ein Büchlein von der Liebe* by, 501; *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* by, 501

Strauss, David: *Leben Jesu* by, 505
Sulpician *émigrés* in United States, 213
Sulpicians: diocesan seminaries, 418; reorganized, 417; among September victims, 194 note
Sunday observance: prescribed, 468; Suppression of, 285
Switzerland
  Catholic cantons of, 338
  Catholic revolt in, 338
  Concordat with, 474
  Democracy in, 337
  Dioceses of, 474
  French *émigrés* in, 208
  French invasion of, 337
  Protestant cantons of, 337
System of morality, Proposed, 333

Taine on Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 335
Talleyrand-Périgord (bishop)
  Absent from Paris, 375
  Changed attitudes of, 98
  And concordat of 1801, 361, 369
  At Constituent Assembly, 97 ff.
  Expilly consecrated by, 140 note
  Made minister of foreign affairs, 361
  Marriage of, 361, 369, 376 note
  Oath to the Constitution, 153
  Oath taken by, 159
  On the organic articles, 384
  Replaced by Champagny, 420
  On sale of Church property, 99
  Vocation of, 98 note
Tassy, Father: Murder of, 178
Tencin, Madame de: Salon of, 33
Terror, the: organized by Marat, 197; under the Directory, 289
Terror, The Belgian, 313
Teutschen Volksbücher by Goerres, 502
Teutschland und die Revolution by Goerres, 502
Theologicon, the: by Bulgaris, 529
Theology: Influence of Wolff on, 26; Study of, 38
Theophilanthropy, 280
Théorie du pouvoir by Bonald, 489 note
Théot, Catherine (visionary), 119
Thuin, Project of, 65 note
Thureau-Dangin, *Renaissance catholique en Angleterre* by, 505
Tieck, *Franz Sternbold* by, 499
Tilsit, Treaty of, 416: and Poland, 543
Tippo Sahib, 328
Tithes, Abolition of, 81: Juigné on, 82; Mirabeau on, 81, 99; Sieyès on, 81
Tithes, Monetary value of the, 94 note
Tolentino: Napoleon at, 296; Treaty of, 297
Torné, Anastase (bishop), 175
Trappist abbey at Boscodon, 308 note
Trappists re-established, 418
Tratto dei delitti e delle pene by Beccaria, 27, 32
Treaty of Tolentino, 297
Treilhard (Gallican): in ecclesiastical committee, 109; Qualities of, 96; on state control of religion, 117; at States General, 69
Trusteeism in United States, 477
Tsiou, Father: Chinese missioner in Korea, 515
Tuffin, Armand: leader of Brittany, 235
Turreau (Republican general), 258
Tuscany, Duke of, 57

Ubi primum (bull), 471
Unbelief, Spread of, 33
"United Bishops," encyclical of, 275
United Kingdom, the, 342
United States
  French *émigré* priests in, 212
  Nomination of bishops, 477
  Pius VI and Church in, 50
  Priests from Santo Domingo in, 214
  Sulpician *émigrés* in, 213
  Trusteeism in, 477
Upper clergy of France, 15: and the state, 16; and States General, 67
Upper clergy of Germany, Opposition to Rome by, 17
Ursulines, Execution of, 254
Utopia by Thomas More, 24

Van den Schiren (O.F.M.), 39
Vargas, Spanish minister at Rome, 396
Vatican, Pillage of, 318
Vatican library, 479
Vendean army: Defeat of, 249; Dissent in, 248; Excesses of, 247
Vendean treaty, 259
Vendean War, Second period of, 246
Vendée, the
  Brittany and, 236 ff.
  Convention's decree of extermination, 246

Vendée (*continued*)
  Clergy of, 236
  First insurgents of, 241 ff.
  Intruding priests in, 237
  Owners and tenants in, 236
  Resistance of, 239
Venice, Conclave at (1799), 328, 344
Verdun, Taking of, 182
Versailles: Murder of priests at, 191; Paris mob at, 82; States General at, 63
Vienna, Pius VI's visit to, 52
Vienna, Congress of: Consalvi at, 461
Vincentians: in China, 518; re-established, 406, 417
Vindiciae gallicae by Mackintosh, 202
Vittoria, *De jure belli* by, 29
Volney, kicked by Napoleon, 360
Voltaire, 33
  Debt to English philosophers, 23
  Discourses on Man by, 34
  Early life of, 34
  Epitres à Uranie by, 34
  Ideas of, 34
  Influence of, 71
Voltaire (*continued*)
  Ninon de Lenclos and, 33
  In Paris, 44
  Philosophical Letters by, 34
  On state control of Church, 113
  Writings of, 34
Vows, religious: Suspension of, 107, 110

War of the Austrian Succession, 9
Warsaw archbishopric, 473
Weekly holyday (decadaire), 284 ff.
White Russia, 55 note
Weishaupt, Adam: and Illuminati, 40 f.
Wiener Kirchenzeitung, 89
Wietinghoff, Juliana von. *See* Krüdner
Wolfenbüttel Fragments, 26
Wolff, Christian: Doctrines of, 26

Yung, Joannes, 39

Zelada (cardinal), 131: Secretary of State, 291; on taking the oath, 195
Zelanti, the, 49
Zoglio, nuncio at Munich, 18

DATE DUE

NOV 24 1970
FEB 2 1971
MAY 13 1980

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
BX945 .M72 v.7
Mourret, Fer/A history of the Catholic c
3 3645 00049580 7

5927

45927

BX945 .M6813 1930
v.7
Mourret, Fernand, 1854-1938.
A history of the Catholic
church

Dominican College Library
San Rafael, California